

# Armenian Noble Houses

Prepared by Robert G. Bedrosian

---

For reading online at *Encyclopaedia Iranica*:

[Naxarar](#), by Nina Garsoian.

[Amatuni](#), by Cyril Toumanoff.

[Arsacids](#), by Cyril Toumanoff.

[Artsruni](#), by Cyril Toumanoff.

[Bagratids](#), by Cyril Toumanoff.

[Kamsarakan](#), by Cyril Toumanoff.

[Mamikonean Family](#), by Nina Garsoian.

Wikipedia entry: [Armenian Nobility](#).

---

**The materials below are available at Internet Archive for reading online and/or downloading in various formats.**

[Կամսարականների ղեաքը Շիրաքայ եւ Արշարունեաց Kamsarakannere" deark' Shirak'ay ew Arsharuneats' \[The Kamsarakans: Lords of Shirak' and Arsharunik'\]](#), by Sahak Kogean (Vienna, 1926), in 192 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 110.

[Գնունեաց եւ Ռշտունեաց նախարարութիւնների Gnuneats' ew R'shtuneats' naxararut'iwnnere" \[The Gnunik' and Rshtunik' Naxarardoms\]](#), by Hamazasp Oskean (Vienna, 1952), in 168 pdf pages. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 171.

[Ուսումնասիրութիւններ հայ նախարարութիւններու մասին Usumnasirut'iwnner hay naxararut'iwnneru masin \[Studies on the Armenian Naxarardoms\]](#), by Hamazasp Oskean (Vienna, 1955), in 132 pdf pages. Families studied: Xorxor'unik', Dimak'seank', Ake'ats'ik', Andzewats'ik', and Amatunik'. *Azgayin matenadaran* series, volume 178.

[Ֆեոդալիզմը հին Հայաստանում Feodalizme" hin Hayastanum \[Feudalism in Ancient Armenia\]](#), *Arshakunineri u marzpanut'ean shrjan* [the Arsacid and Marzpanate period], by Hagop A. Manandian (Erevan, 1934), in 339 pdf pages.

See also: [Selected Writings of Hagop A. Manandian](#).

[Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia](#), by Nina G. Garsoian, from *Hande's Amso'reay* 90 (1976), columns 177-234, in 29 pdf pages.

["Les familles féodales d'Arménie et leurs possessions héréditaires", d'A. Ter-Ghévondian](#), in 17 pdf pages. This translation was made by M. Canard from Ter-Ghewondyan's Russian work *Armeniia i arabskii xalifat* (Erevan, 1977), pp. 180-193, and concentrates on the eighth century. The present translation appeared in *Armenian Studies in Memoriam Haig Berberian* (Lisbon, 1986), Dickran Kouymjian, editor, pp. 89-104.

Information on the southern *naxarar* Houses in the 8th-9th centuries may be found on Ter-Ghewondyan's *Selected Writings* page, in his study *The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*, especially in Chapter I. 7: [The Assimilation of the Arab Emirates into the Ranks of the Armenian Naxarars](#), pp. 45-50.

Available for reading online at the website of OpenEdition books is *L'Arménie et Byzance* (Paris, 1996) from the series *Byzantina Sorbonensia*, pp. 79-88: [Les princes Arméniens de l'Euphratèse et l'Empire byzantin \(fin xie - milieu xiiie s.\)](#), by Gerard Dedeyan.

Our Ph.D. dissertation, *The Turco-Mongol Invasions and the Lords of Armenia in the 13-14th Centuries* (Columbia University, 1979), contains several sections which describe the *naxarars* before and during the 13th-14th centuries:

[Armenia's Lords and Their Reactions to the Turco-Mongol Invasions and Domination of the 13-14th Centuries](#)

[The Naxarars and the Invasions of the Early 13th Century](#)

[Mongol Control Techniques in the 13th Century](#)

[Triumph of the Turkmens](#)

[Naxarar Reactions to Mongol Control Techniques of the 13-14th Centuries](#)

Appendices:

A. [Supplementary Notes on the 11-13th Century Naxarars](#)

B. [Aspects of Centrifugalism within and among Certain 13-14th Century Naxarardoms](#)

[Artsrunid House of Sefedinian: Survival of a Princely Dynasty in Ecclesiastical Guise](#), by Robert H. Hewsen, from *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 1(1984), pp. 123-137, in 18 pdf pages, including genealogical charts.

[In Search of Armenian Nobility: Five Armenian Families of the Ottoman Empire](#), by Robert H. Hewsen, from *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 3(1987), pp. 93-117, in 25 pdf pages, including genealogical charts.

[The Armenian Amira Class of Istanbul](#), by Hagop Levon Barsoumian, in 258 bookmarked and searchable pdf pages. This is the author's Ph.D. dissertation (Columbia University, 1980). The *Amiras* were a class of influential wealthy Armenians in the Ottoman capital between the 18th and 19th centuries.

[The Amiras: Lords of Ottoman Armenia](#), by Pascal Carmont, translated from French by Marika Blandin (London, 2012), in 143 bookmarked and searchable pdf pages, with many photos and illustrations.

Wikipedia entry: [Melikdoms of Karabakh](#).

**At Internet Archive, for reading online and/or downloading in various formats:**

[The Origin of the \*Naxarar\* System](#). These sections from Nicholas Adontz's *Armenia in the Period of Justinian* (1908) treat the history of the lordly (*naxarar*) system on the Armenian Highlands. English translation, updated notes and bibliography, and new appendices by Nina G. Garsoian (1970). Included are Chapters 9-15 (pages 165-372), their Footnotes (pages 433-529), Appendices I-V (pages 1\*-246\*), and full Bibliography (247\*-303\*). Eastern Armenia: Chapter 9, Armenia—the *Marzpanate*; Chapter 10, A Quantitative Analysis of the *Naxarardoms*; Chapter 11, Territorial Analysis of the *Naxarar* System; Chapter 12, The *Naxarar* System and the Church. The Origin of the *Naxarar* System: Chapter 13, Preliminary Excursus; Chapter 14, The Tribal Bases of the *Naxarar* System; Chapter 15, The Feudal Bases of the *Naxarar* System.

**Cyril Toumanoff**

**Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963):**

[I. The Social Background of Christian Caucasia](#)

[II. States and Dynasties of Caucasia in the Formative Centuries](#)

[III. The Orontids of Armenia](#)

[IV. Iberia \[Georgia\] between Chosroid and Bagratid Rule](#)

[V. The Armeno-Georgian Marchlands](#)

See also: [Selected Writings of Cyril Toumanoff](#).

[Documents pour servir a l'histoire des Lusignans de la petite Armenie \(1342-1394\)](#), by Victor Langlois (Paris, 1859), in 71 pdf pages. Langlois' invaluable study of the French noble family of Lusignan with branches in Cyprus, Antioch, and the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia. After the murder of the Hetumid Leon IV in 1341, his cousin Guy de Lusignan was elected king of Cilicia. The pro-Latin family tried unsuccessfully to impose Catholicism in the country, which led to constant civil unrest. Lusignan kings of Cilicia included: Constantine II (1342-1344); Constantine III (1344-1362); Constantine IV (1362-1373); and Leo V (1374-1393). The Cilician Armenian kingdom was inherited by the Cypriot Lusignans in 1393.

[New Additions](#) (Nobility/Noble Houses), latest at the top of the list.

See also: [Armenian Resource Guides](#), at Internet Archive.

in achieving the goals missed by his predecessors. However, he too clashed in his turn with the Bagratids, and with him the Djahhāfids disappeared once and for all from the scene.

The younger Djahhāf came at a time when Ašot (the son and successor of Smbat *sparapet* who had been captured by Bugha) had gradually restored, with his brother Abas, the shaken position of the Bagratids in the political life of Armenia. In speaking of these events, Asoġik says that Šahap (i.e. Djahhāf) son of Sewaday had «come ... to this land of Armenia» in E.A. 312 (= A.D. 863) (146). That is to say, after Ašot had been designated as Prince of Princes of Armenia. Are we to conclude from Asoġik's words that Djahhāf had come to Armenia from outside? It is probable that after their defeat the remaining Djahhāfids had found refuge in some neighbouring land such as Azerbaidjan or Aġjnik'. Djahhāf came with a large army, «an overwhelming host», which could have been given to him only by a mighty prince. The very fact that Abas *sparapet* was forced to attack Djahhāf's host with an army of forty thousand men in order to defeat it bears witness to its might. Djahhāf advanced as far as the province of Aršarunik' where Abas annihilated his entire army and perpetrated such a slaughter that Djahhāf was forced to flee with barely twenty-six men, «...and Šahap remained with 26 men and he left and fled shamefully» (147). At approximately this same time (A.D. 865), we have the mention of a Djahhāf b. Sawāda as the commander of the Arab forces at Melitene (148). It is, therefore, probable that he went to seek his fortune there.

Thus, the Djahhāfids vanished forever, having failed to create a lasting principality in the course of their half-century of effort. Nevertheless they served as a precedent for the establishment of new Arab emirates, and particularly for the appearance of their kinsmen the Kaysites on the political scene.

## 7. *The Assimilation of the Arab Emirates into the Ranks of the Armenian Naxarars*

At the time of their emergence from the Arabic peninsula, the military aristocracy of the Arab tribes (tribal chiefs, etc.) settled in a land whose economic conditions and social structure differed radically from their own. In the Arabian desert (149), the warlike tribes had had a definite territory for their activities, in which they wandered caring only for their flocks. It is obvious that under such conditions, agriculture and crafts could not emerge from a primitive level, either there or especially in Yemen and a few other regions.

In Arab society, the tribe was the all-important unit. It was the fundamental nucleus around which developed both political and social life. Family blood ties played a definite part in Arab life, since the tribe required a fanatical allegiance from its members. The tribe was subject to its chief,



who was characterized by strikingly patriarchal traits, and who was chosen from one of the families holding a dominant position in the given tribe.

This situation altered radically when the Arab tribes under the banner of Islam sallied forth in massive groups from the arid desert toward the fertile valleys of Mesopotamia and Egypt, or even, moving still further afield, to the Valley of the Indus in the East or to Spain in the West. For nearly a century after the beginning of the invasions, the Arab tribes concerned themselves exclusively with warlike activities (150). Consequently, they showed no great tendencies toward settlement and the acquisition of land in the countries which they had taken. In the period of the first four Caliphs who had succeeded the prophet, and even to some degree in that of the Umayyads, the Arabs were satisfied with the tribute of the conquered territories, which they collected by means of the lands and poll taxes levied on Christians (though generally not on Muslims). The conquests reached their peak in the reigns of the Umayyad Caliphs, 'Abd al-Malik and his son al-Walid (arm. Vlit'), A.D. 685-715, when the Arabs acquired Central Asia, the Valley of the Indus and Spain. By the second quarter of the eighth century, the conquests had come to an end, and the Arab military chiefs and generals, who had already attained high positions in other countries, had not yet laid down their weapons only in frontier districts, such as the provinces bordering on the Byzantine Empire.

Various Arab tribes settled in the provinces of the Caliphate. The Yemenites were established in southern Syria, whereas the Kays-'Aylān from the northern group (part of which subsequently crossed into Armenia) were settled in the mid-Euphratine district of the Djazīra. As long as the wars of conquest continued, the military spirit of the Arab tribes remained high, but by the time of the last Umayyads, and especially in the second quarter of the eighth century, the tendency to settle permanently in the conquered lands and the urge to acquire domains in them gradually developed.

During the period of conquest, the Caliphs strove by every means at their disposal to prevent the acquisition of domains by the Arabs outside of the Arab peninsula. The Caliph 'Umar (A.D. 634-644) even forbade this by decree, since he was persuaded that the acquisition of landholds by the Arabs would weaken their martial spirit and make them subject to local customs (151). Nevertheless, the natural course of development could not be halted, so that the last period of the conquering era became simultaneously the beginning of a new era in which the upper stratum of the Arab tribes began to grow closer to the local aristocracies. This phenomenon is mostly characteristic of the 'Abbāsid period, and it marks a radical cleavage which had developed in the Arab social structure. The lands in which the Arab tribes had settled had already entered into the phase of feudal development for some centuries, consequently the Arabs of necessity not only influenced, but, to a greater degree, were themselves influenced by the institutions of the conquered lands. The period of Arab military feudalism was inaugu-

rated, and took different forms in different regions. Thus, for instance, the contemporary Arab military aristocracy holds much of the lands in its hands in Arab countries and constitutes the landlord class in these countries; whereas in other countries, such as Iran, the local aristocracy did not surrender its position to the conquerors. The Persian aristocracy accepted Islam, and for a time Arabic even became the literary language of Persia, but the Arab emirs were never able to acquire great tracts of land in Iran or to drive out the Persian land holders.

As we have already said, the Caliphs did not condone the acquisition of landed estates by the Arab military contingents during the formative period of the Caliphate. The governors of provinces were changed so rapidly that each one remained in office barely a few years. Moreover they were appointed from different families so that the members of a family should not develop claims over lands which they had ruled in hereditary succession. In Egypt between A.D. 640 and 869, that is to say for a period of more than two centuries, over one hundred governors succeeded one another (152), while twenty governors ruled in Spain (al-Andalus) during the Umayyad period (711-756) (153). In Armenia twenty-three *ostikans*, generally without family ties, were alternated during the nearly half-century of Umayyad rule (154).

In the 'Abbāsid period this policy changed to some extent. The former tribal chiefs and military leaders were already tied to the lands over which they had been ruling in hereditary fashion. Even the office of *ostikan* occasionally became hereditary as in the case of the Shaybānī and Sulamī emirs of Arminiya who furnished large numbers of *ostikans*. Nevertheless, the policy of rotating *ostikans* at a rapid rate was also reinforced. In the one hundred and thirty years of 'Abbāsid rule, the *ostikan* was changed in Armīniya approximately eighty-five times as a method of preventing the development of centrifugal tendencies.

The Arab tribes settled in certain districts of Armenia in the 'Abbāsid period found themselves in a different milieu from the one found by those settled in Mesopotamia or Syria. In Armenia they constituted a numerical minority even though they enjoyed the protection of the rulers of the land. Consequently it was obviously impossible for them to become the masters of the country in a brief span of time as had been the case in Mesopotamia and Syria.

The Shaybānī easily dominated Ajnik' because of the easy conquest of Syria and Mesopotamia, since Ajnik' in this period formed a part of Upper Mesopotamia. They still felt no great need to amalgamate themselves into the milieu of the Armenian *naḡarars*, even though the *ostikanate* of Armīniya was one of the essential areas for their designs and activities.

Such was not the case, however, for the Djaḥḥāfid and Zurārid houses. Djaḥḥāf and his descendants displayed the greatest flexibility and resorted to every means to obtain results in Armenia. Where the Shaybānī and

other houses had become assimilated through their inclusion into the ranks of the feudal nobility and become hereditary feudatories themselves, the Djahhāfids even strove to link themselves with the Armenian *naḫarars* through family ties in order to profit from their hereditary rights. It was through a marriage that Djahhāf the Elder had sought to obtain rights over the Mamikonean house. This marriage with the daughter of the ruined Mamikoneans made it possible for him to become the hereditary claimant of Tarōn, Tayk', and other domains. Seeing the weakness of this position, however, his nephew Sawāda married not the daughter of a decaying house, but Princess Aruseak from the rapidly rising Bagratids, and he maintained good relations with the Armenian *naḫarars*. It is obvious that family ties presuppose the acceptance of Armenian *naḫarar* customs as an indispensable step for the success of the Djahhāfid plans. Having emerged from their tribal background, the Djahhāfids thus fell into a purely Armenian *naḫarar* milieu. Consequently, the local influence exerted over them must have been very powerful.

Mūsā b. Zurāra lord of Arzn and Baleš displayed similar tendencies toward rapprochement and assimilation. He was married to the sister of the mightiest Bagratid prince, Bagarat of Tarōn, whose possessions bordered on his own domains. As the brother-in-law of such a powerful ruler he could feel secure from any claims, even those of the Arcrunis (although they subsequently attacked the lands of his last descendants south of Lake Van, under the leadership of Gagik Arcruni, at the beginning of the tenth century). This relationship did not, however, prevent Mūsā from fighting against his brother-in-law, so that the intercession of his wife was needed after his defeat to save the city of Baleš from the vengeance of the Armenians. Mūsā's son Abu'l-Maghra, who was Armenian on his mother's side, subsequently married an Arcruni princess, and was so thoroughly «Armenized» that he even secretly adopted Christianity. As a son-in-law of the Arcrunis, Abu'l-Maghra had almost become one of them, and when the great Arcruni princes went into battle, the forces of the lord of Arzn accompanied them (155a). This rapprochement of the Zurārids with the Armenian *naḫarars* was not the result of their designs (as had been the case with the Djahhāfids), but was obviously a means of self-protection from their immediate neighbours the Shaybānī who presented such a threat, that the Zurārids naturally sought the protection of the Armenian *naḫarar* houses. As we shall see, it was in fact the Shaybānī who destroyed the power of the Zurārids by extending their dominion over the latter's possessions.

It should be emphasized that this tendency toward assimilation found among the Arab emirs is exclusively a phenomenon of the late eighth and ninth centuries. In a later period, as we shall see, the Kaysites of Manazkert manifested no such tendencies, and this change is to be explained by the contemporary conditions. As contemporaries of the Bagratid kingdom, the Kaysites obviously could not achieve the same assimilation as the Djahhā-

fids. They lived as isolated as possible from the Armenian *naxarar* world and were connected for the most part with the *Shaybānī* of Aḥnik' and the *Hamdānids*. It is true that the *Kaysites* as well as 'Uthmānids of Berkri had certain relations with the Armenian *naxarars*, especially with the *Arcrunis* and the *Bagratids* (both of Ani and of Tarōn), but they never achieved the close connexions which had been enjoyed by the *Djahhāfids* and others. The tendency to merge with the Armenian *naxarars* was to reappear still more powerfully at a later date, at the time of the infiltration of the Kurdish elements, of whom we shall speak in their place.

The clearest proof of the fusion into the ranks of local feudatories is provided by the separatist tendencies manifested by the Arab colonists of the first half of the ninth century. The Arab contingents settled in Armenia proved a two edged sword for the Caliphate. They provided faithful support for the subordination of the local elements (Armenians, Iberians, Albanians), and furnished a particularly trustworthy source of protection against Greek and Khazar attacks. But, once the Arab military leaders had become land owners, they began to seek every opportunity of breaking their ties with the Caliphate and of becoming independent rulers (arab. *mutaghalliba* — from the verb *taghballa*, «conquer, dominate, triumph over») (157). The center of this dissident movement was Derbent, which had been inhabited by Arabs as early as the Umayyad period, even though the Caliphs had used all available means of keeping the Arab warriors of the region satisfied, because of its strategic importance for the Khazar war (158).

The revolt of the Persian Abū Muslim al-Shārī began in Armīniya in the 790's, during the reign of the initiator of Arab colonization, Hārūn al-Rashīd (159). This revolt flared up after the murder of the tax collector Abu'l Ṣabbā, which had occurred at Partaw and alarmed the Arab administrators. As we have seen, al-Shārī even went so far as to besiege Dwin for a few months. The *ostikan*, Khālīd b. Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī and his general 'Abd al-Malik al-Ḥarashī were defeated by al-Shārī, as was Khālīd's successor. At the same time Muhalhil al-Tamīnī revolted in Azerbaidjan. Hārūn al-Rashīd consequently sent Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī with an army of ten thousand men against al-Shārī, while he sent Yaḥyā al-Ḥarashī with twelve thousand men against the rebels in Azerbaidjan. After pacifying Azerbaidjan, Yaḥyā came to join Yazīd. Al-Shārī died at that time and his successor Sakan b. Mūsā al-Baylaḳānī was taken prisoner and sent to Baghdad.

Although the revolt of Bābak was essentially a revolt of local Iranian elements against the oppression of the Caliphate and against Islam, in Armīniya, it also served to consolidate the position of the Armenian and Albanian *naxarars* and to encourage the Arab *mutaghalliba*. We even find an occasion when the Arab governor joined with the rebels. Thus, when the newly arrived governor of Armīniya and Azerbaidjan, Hatim b. Harthama b. A'yān, heard the news of his father's murder, he immediately entered into contact

with Bābak and the Armenian *naxarars* to prepare a revolt, but soon died himself (160).

As we have already seen, the revolt of Djahhāf and his successors began in Armenia, while the movement of Muḥammad b. 'Attābī took place in Iberia (161). The Arab governor, 'Abd-Allāh b. Aḥmad al-Sulamī, having proved helpless against the rebel, the Caliph al-Ma'mūn sent Khālid b. Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī, who reduced Muḥammad b. 'Attābī to obedience. Some time later, Ishāk b. Ismā'il, who was the local administrator in Djurzān [Iberia] representing the governor of Armīniya, made himself master of the situation in Tiflis [Tp'tis]. Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Shaybānī the son of the abovementioned Khālid, fought against him, although without success, and Bugha had Ishāk b. Ismā'il put to death at the time of his famous expedition (162). It is interesting to note that during all of these rebellions the Shaybānī emirs remained loyal to the 'Abbāsīd Caliphs. As the holders of high offices in Armīniya, Azerbaidjan, and the Djazīra, they even take on the aspect of oppressors.

The revolts of the Arab rulers established in Armenia, Iberia, and Albania might seem to have profitted these countries insofar as they were rebellions directed against the Caliphate, but in fact they brought great damage to these countries and laid the foundation for new difficulties. The goal of the firmly established Arab rulers was merely to sink deep roots into their own districts. Even after the decline of the Caliphate, they remained a long time, creating independent emirates, and preventing the consolidation and reinforcement of the Armenian, Iberian, and Albanian kingdoms.

119. John Drasxanakertc'i, p. 145, «ընդվզեալ եւ խանդացեալ ընդ  
նստիկանին Հօլայ» [= Saint-Martin tr., p. 101].
120. *Idem.*
121. Moses Kalankatwac'i, pp. 374-375 [= Dowsett tr. p. 214]. The historian gives  
the date of these events as E.A. 270 (= A.D. 821/2) which seems unlikely.
122. Ya'kūbi, II, p. 564.
123. Al-Ṭabari, III, p. 1409.
124. Ya'kūbi, II, p. 565.
125. Vardan, p. 109, «Արլիերք ռմն ի տանէն Ջահապայ . . .»
126. Ibn al-Athir, VII, p. 38.
127. Thomas Arcruni, p. 106 [= Brosset tr., pp. 94-95].
128. *Ibid.*, p. 108 [= Brosset tr., p. 96].
129. *Idem.*
130. *Idem.* [= Brosset tr., pp. 97-99].
131. *Idem.* [= Brosset tr. p. 97], «Բայց ի գնալ մեծ հազարապետին  
յարբունիս՝ հաւատաց՝ զվերակացութիւնն աշխարհիս Հայոց եւ հարկս  
արբունի ի ձեռս Մուսէի ումեմն որդւոյ Զօրահայի հազարացւոյ, որ  
տիրէր յայնժամ Արգնայ եւ ներքոյ կողմանն Աղձնեաց մերձ ի սահմանս  
Տարունոյ»
132. Al-Balādhuri, p. 212 [= Hitti tr., p. 331].
133. *Ibid.*, p. 211 [= Hitti tr., p. 331]. Al-Ṭabari, III, p. 1584. Markwart, *Südar-  
menien*, p. 361 [Cf. Zambaur, *Manuel*, pp. 177, 179, who gives the form «asch-Scharâbi»].
134. Thomas Arcruni, pp. 111-112 [= Brosset tr., pp. 99-100].
135. *Ibid.*, p. 113 [= Brosset tr., p. 100].
136. *Ibid.*, p. 116 [= Brosset tr., p. 102, and n. 5.].
137. Al-Balādhuri, pp. 211-212 [= Hitti tr., pp. 330-331. Cf. Thomas Arcruni,  
pp. 119-121 = Brosset tr., pp. 104-105].
138. *Ibid.*, p. 131, «եւ ընդ նմա Տանիկի Հայաստանեայց, որ բնակեալ  
էին ի կողմանս աշխարհիս՝ առաջնորդէին Բուհայի ի մուտ եւ ելս  
աշխարհիս :» [= Brosset tr., p. 112].
139. Al-Ṭabari, III, p. 1409.
140. Thomas Arcruni, p. 116, «քեզ եւ զաւակի քու ռաց գերկիրն զայն ի  
Ժառանգութիւն [= Brosset tr., p. 103].
141. Laurent, *L'Arménie*, pp. 338-340. Nalbandyan, «Tax-Policy», pp. 106-111.
142. Thomas Arcruni, p. 197, «քաղաքացիքն Բերկրոյ որ Ուր-մանիկքն  
կոչին . . . :» [= Brosset tr., p. 158].
143. *Ibid.*, p. 247 [= Brosset tr., p. 200].
144. Al-Balādhuri, pp. 211-212 [= Hitti tr., p. 331].
145. Thomas Arcruni, pp. 151-152, «սկսան այնուհետեւ աներկիւղ  
համարձակութեամբ սփռել տարածանել ի վերայ երեսաց երկիրս  
ամենայն ազգքն Տանկաց, որ ելեալ էին զհետ նորա ընտանեօք  
իւրեանց, եւ ձեռնամուխ եղեն բաժանել գերկիրն յինքեանս. եւ  
արկանէին վիճակս եւ լարս ձգէին ի վերայ սահմանաց եւ բնակէին  
յամուրս աշխարհիս աներկիւղս .» [= Brosset tr., p. 127].
146. Asolik, p. 110 [Dulaurier tr., p. 138].
147. *Idem.*, «Իսկ Շահապայ իգ արամբք մագապուր արծեալ անցեալ  
գնայր ամօթալիգ :»



148. Al-Tabari, III, p. 1606.
149. G. Rentz, «Djazirat al-<sup>c</sup>Arab», *EI*<sup>2</sup>, I, pp. 543-546. P. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, pp. 23-29.
150. W. Caskel, «al-<sup>c</sup>Arab», *EI*<sup>2</sup>, I, pp. 527-529.
151. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, pp. 169-173.
152. S. Lane-Poole, *A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages* (London, 1901), pp. 45-58.
153. E. Lévi-Provençal, «al-Andalus», *EI*<sup>2</sup>, I, p. 493.
154. Nalbandyan, «Tax-Policy», pp. 106-111.
155. *Ibid.*, pp. 111-124.
- [155a. John Drasjanakertc'i, p. 218 [= Saint-Martin tr., p. 116. Thomas Arcruni, p. 213 = Brosset tr., p. 172].
156. Al-Balādhurī, p. 205 [= Hitti tr., p. 322] reports that the mother of the famous *ostikan* of Armīniya, Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī was the daughter of the Patrician of Sisadjān [Siwnik], however, this cannot be taken as a family link since she had obviously been carried off at the time of the conquering expedition of Muḥammad b. Marwān.
157. Zhuze, «The Mutaghalliba», pp. 199, 210.
158. Al-Balādhurī, p. 207 [= Hitti tr., pp. 324-325].
159. Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 515-516.
160. *Ibid.*, p. 563.
161. *Ibid.*, p. 565.
162. Al-Balādhurī, p. 212 [= Hitti tr., p. 332].

## CHAPTER — II

1. J. Laurent, *L'Arménie*, pp. 322-326.
2. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando*, I, p. 198/9.
3. Canard, «H'amdanides», p. 82.
4. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando*, I, p. 198/9.
5. Markwart, *Südarmenien*, p. 501. [Cf. Thomas Arcruni, p. 218 et passim [= Brosset tr., p. 175, etc.].
6. Ibn Miskawayh, II, pp. 201-202 [= translation H. F. Amedroz and D.S. Margoliouth, *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate* (London, 1920-1921), V, p. 216]. Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, p. 180.
7. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando*, I, p. 204/5.
8. Canard, *Dynastie*, p. 474.
9. *The Book of Letters* (Tiflis, 1901), p. 498. [in arm.].
10. Thomas Arcruni, pp. 246 [cf. 215, in both cases the form given in the text is «Manazawean» var. «Manazōnean» = Brosset tr., pp. 199, 172].
11. *The Book of Letters*, pp. 498, 500, «... կոտորեալսն ի սրոյ՝ վրիժախնդիր հեթանոս ամիրային Ապլվարդայ, որ արդարեւ գաւազան սրտմտութեան ի ձեռին Տեառն Յիսուսի ... Քանզի եւ այն հզար այր ... որ զանիծեալ գնախնիս ևոցա խայտառակամահ սատակեաց ... Քրիստոս յերիր աւուր յարեալ, արդ մինչ դու գեեզ Քրիստոս անուանես, սպանանեմ գեեզ եւ քաղեմ, եւ դու գկնի Լ, աւուր կենդանացիր. ես գիտեմ թէ Քրիստոս իցես,»  
[= translation, F. C. Conybeare, *The Key of Truth* (Oxford, 1898), Appendix I, pp. 126, 128].



**This is an authorized facsimile  
and was produced by microfilm-xerography  
in 1981 by  
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL  
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.  
London, England**

8008701

BEDROSIAN, ROBERT GREGORY

THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE LORDS OF ARMENIA IN THE 13-14TH  
CENTURIES

Columbia University

PH.D.

1979

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

18 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4EJ, England

Copyright 1979

by

BEDROSIAN, ROBERT GREGORY

All Rights Reserved

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE LORDS  
OF ARMENIA IN THE 13-14TH CENTURIES

Robert Gregory Bedrosian

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree  
of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Faculty of Philosophy  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
1979

## ABSTRACT

### THE TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND THE LORDS OF ARMENIA IN THE 13-14TH CENTURIES

ROBERT GREGORY BEDROSIAN

The 13-14th centuries was a period of great turbulence in the history of the Armenian people. Over roughly 170 years (from ca. 1220 to ca. 1403) Armenia was subjected to no less than 15 invasions of Turco--Mongol peoples. The Armenian societies conquered and controlled by the various nomadic invaders from Central Asia had already experienced conquest and domination by nomadic and sedentarizing Turkic peoples two centuries earlier. The experience of invasion by nomads from Central Asia consequently, was not new to the Armenian historical experience. But there were differences among the invading groups, and differences within any one invading group.

Just as there were differences among and even within the different invading groups, so the sedentary Armenian societies which came to be dominated were of different sorts. Subject to different political entities, the various districts of "Armenia" in the 13-14th centuries were (and had been, historically) subjected to different

ethnic, economic, and cultural stimuli. The Armenian or part-Armenian populations of these states subscribed to a variety of religions ranging from Apostolic, Orthodox, and Roman Catholic Christianity, to Islam. Even north-eastern Armenian society (for which the historical record is the most complete) on the eve of the Turco-Mongol invasions was far from being a homogeneous ethnic, cultural or religious entity. Even where Armenians were in political control of Armenian-inhabited territories, a geographically--derived centrifugalism made the lords (naxarars) of the various districts disinclined to unite. In the 13-14th centuries, therefore, Armenia experienced the effects of a double centrifugation: of Turco-Mongol societies in dissolution, and of native Armenian naxarar society, which was itself characterized by centrifugation.

This study has two principal aims. A review of the salient political and military events associated with the Turco-Mongol invasions of Armenia is one aim. Who were the invaders, and in what ways were they alike and dissimilar? The second aim of the study is an examination of the impact(s) of the invasions and domination(s) of the 13-14th centuries on Armenia's lordly naxarar rulers. While many aspects of both areas of investigation (i.e., regarding the invasions and dominations and their impacts) have already been examined by scholars, to the present no single study has focussed on the invasions of Armenia as phenomena. Similarly, while diverse aspects of Armenia's

socio-economic and political history in the 13-14th centuries have been examined by others, no single study of the lordly heads of that society has as yet been undertaken. The present work, therefore, attempts to fill a void existing in Armenian scholarship. It is hoped that this study will likewise serve as an introduction to 13-14th century Armenian history for Western scholars, to whom Armenia in this period has remained terra incognita.



# The Turco-Mongol Invasions and the Lords of Armenia in the 13-14th Centuries

---

Robert G. Bedrosian's Ph.D. Dissertation  
(Columbia University, 1979)

This work is in the public domain. It may be copied and distributed freely.

The full dissertation is available at Internet Archive for reading online and/or downloading in various formats:  
[The Turco-Mongol Invasions and the Lords of Armenia in the 13-14th Centuries](#).

---

## Table of Contents

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

The Sources

Armenia and the Turco-Mongol Invasions

[Armenia's Lords and their Reactions to the Turco-Mongol  
Invasions and Domination of the 13-14th Centuries](#)

[The \*Naxarars\* and the Invasions of the Early 13th Century](#)

[Mongol Control Techniques in the 13th Century](#)

[Triumph of the Turkmens](#)

[Naxarar Reactions to Mongol Control Techniques of the 13-14th Centuries](#)

[Conclusion](#)

---

[Appendix A.](#)

Supplementary Notes on the 11-13th Century *Naxarars*

[Appendix B.](#)

Aspects of Centrifugalism within and among Certain 13-14th Century *Naxarardoms*

## [Appendix C.](#)

### Notes on the Relations between the Mongols and the Armenian Church in the 13th Century

#### Bibliography:

[1. Sources](#)

[2. Literature](#)

#### [Glossary](#)

---

©1979 R. Bedrosian

## INTRODUCTION

The history of Greater Armenia in the 13-14th centuries is not well known to Western scholars. To Armenists, however, with the possible exception of Armenia's "golden age" (5th century A.D.), no period has received as much attention as the 13-14th centuries. The nature and diversity of the primary sources as well as the uses to which they have been put provide explanations for both opposing tendencies. Western scholars have been most interested in the Armenian sources for what they tell about the Mongols. Such interest explains the translated anthologies of relevant sections of the Armenian sources<sup>1</sup> which focus on the Mongols in Armenia or the Mongols in the Armenian sources, but not on Armenia or the Armenians per se. Despite the existence of such anthologies and of full translations of the Armenian sources (in some cases for over 100 years),

---

1

For example, K. Patkanov's two-volume Russian anthology which appeared in St. Petersburg in 1873 and 1874, Istoriia mongolov po armianskim istochnikam [History of the Mongols According to the Armenian Sources] which includes extracts from Vardan, Orbelean, Smbat Sparapet, and Kirakos Ganjakec'i; A.G. Galstyan's Armianskie istochniki o mongolakh [Armenian Sources on the Mongols], (Moscow, 1962); and the translations into English of various passages from Kirakos Ganjakec'i dealing with the Mongols made by J.A. Boyle. Bibliographical indications, when not provided in the text will be found in the Bibliography.

these sources remain under-utilized in some modern studies of the Mongols<sup>1</sup>.

In recent times, works devoted to the history of Asia Minor in the 11-15th centuries have made use of some 13-14th century Armenian sources in translation. C. Cahen's Pre-Ottoman Turkey (New York, 1968) cites several Armenian sources, "those from Cilicia and those from Āzarbāījān" (sic)<sup>2</sup>. His study concentrates on the history of the Turks of western and central Asia Minor. When speaking about the Armenians of eastern Asia Minor, however, Cahen sometimes makes egregious errors<sup>3</sup>. S. Vryonis' Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century (Los Angeles, 1971) utilizes translated Armenian sources more fully than Cahen's work, but as Cahen, Vryonis is not primarily interested in the Armenians of eastern Asia Minor. His work focusses on the Greek element in western and central Asia Minor, mentioning the Armenians only occasionally and peripherally.

---

1

Most surprisingly in B. Spuler's History of the Mongols Based on Eastern and Western Accounts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (Berkeley, 1972) which does not include a single Armenian or Georgian source. J. A. Boyle's scholarly studies are a welcome exception.

2

PT p. 438.

3

PT pp. 204, 326

If the history of 13-14th century Armenia is not well known in the West, the opposite situation prevails among Armenists. Far from being under-studied, the 13-14th centuries have attracted considerable interest. The abundance of source material explains this in part. Armenists have been interested primarily in various aspects of the socio-economic and political life of Armenia during a period when the Mongols figured as conquerors and overlords, but not as creators of that distinctive culture. The first Armenist to deal with the 13-14th centuries was the Mxit'arist father M. ĆamĆean, in the third volume of his History of Armenia (Venice, 1786). ĆamĆean's account, in addition to being clerical and patriotic is also episodic. When faced with insufficient sources for late 13th century Greater Armenia (no published corpora of colophons or inscriptions existed in his day) ĆamĆean moved his focus to Cilician Armenia. The history of Greater Armenia in the 14th century is entirely omitted.

Scholarly activity on the period of interest done during the 19th century may be divided into two main categories. First, the 19th century saw the beginning of the publication of the classical Armenian texts and their translations into European languages, especially into Russian and French. In the absence of critical editions--which have begun to appear only recently-- the

19th century publications are still the ones utilized today. The scholarly notes of the editors and translators of these texts constituted a step forward in the study of the 13-14th centuries. The second category of activity began in the mid-19th century and built into an ever stronger wave of publications devoted to diverse aspects of the period. Such were the numerous historico--geographical studies of authors including S. Jalaleanc', E. Lalayean, M. Barxudareanc' and L. Ališan. In the early 20th century these scholars were joined by many others who turned their attention to the history of one particular feudal family, one city, or monastic complex. Among these were I.A. Orbeli, G. Yovsep'ean, A. Šahnazarean, and L. Movsessean. The general lines of such research were continued and amplified in the 1920-1950's by many scholars working in Europe and in the newly-created Soviet republic of Armenia<sup>1</sup>.

---

1

Foremost among the European Armenists were fathers Nerses Akinean and H. Oskean. Among the numerous Soviet scholars deserving attention belong N. Marr, H. Manandyan, M. Abekyan, T'. Avdalbekyan, X. Samuelyan, S. Eremyan, L. Melik'set'-bek, K. Safadaryan, A. Hovannisyan, H. Zamkočyan, L. Xaçikyan, A. Galstyan, and P. Muradyan. For their contributions see below chapter one (Sources) under Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Vardan Arewelc'i, Step'annos Orbelean, Grigor Aknerc'i, T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, Chronographies and Hagiographical Literature, Colophons, and Inscriptions. See Bibliography for full listing.

In recent times a number of Armenian studies dealing with the 13-14th centuries have appeared. These are H. Manandyan's Critical Survey of the History of the Armenian People, vol. 3 (Erevan, 1952), L.H. Babayan's Socio-Economic and Political History of Armenia in the XIII-XIV Centuries [SEPHA], (Erevan, 1964; Moscow, 1969), and the same author's chapters in vol. 3 of the series History of the Armenian People [HAP], (Erevan, 1976) wherein Babayan revised some of the views expressed in his earlier studies. Manandyan's and Babayan's works concern the socio-economic and political history of Armenia during the 11-14th centuries (Manandyan), 13-14th centuries (Babayan, SEPHA), and the mid-9th--mid-14th centuries (Babayan, HAP) i.e., these studies embrace the Turco-Mongol invasions but do not feature them as the central or sole objects of study. Not only is the focus never on the invasions themselves as phenomena, but there is even some disagreement on periodizing the invasions. Manandyan, both in the chronological limits given to his work and in a chapter in his Trade and Cities of Armenia in Connection with Ancient World Trade (Lisbon, 1965) showed an awareness that Turco-Tatar included the 11th century Saljuqs as well as 13-14th century Mongols, but he nowhere compared and contrasted the invasions. Babayan's work on Armenia in the 13-14th centuries does not treat the Saljuq invasions, nor are the Saljuqs mentioned in his article, "Consequences of the Dominance of the Nomadic Feudal



Economic System on the Economic Life of Sedentary Peoples". Furthermore, vol. 3 of the History of the Armenian People ("Armenia in the Period of Developed Feudalism") does not accept the invasions of Tīmūr in the early 15th century as a terminus, since the volume ends in the mid-14th century. Thus, between Manandyan and Babayan there is no study of the 11-14th century Turco-Mongol invasions as invasions, or even agreement on periodizing the invasions.

The present study has two principal aims. First, the political-military history of the Turco-Mongol invasions from the 11th century to the early years of the 15th century is provided. The invasions, their participants and their consequences are compared and contrasted. Such a review fills a gap both in Western and in Armenian scholarship. The writing of this part of the study was facilitated by the works of Cahen and Vryonis, Manandyan, Babayan, Yuzbašyan and many others--Western and Eastern scholars not well acquainted with each other's work. Because of the complexity of the period and the unfamiliarity of the material to the general reader, background information on Armenia in the pre-Saljuq period (especially the political-ethnic conditions on Armenia's elusive borders) is provided in the notes to chapter two ("Armenia and the Turco-Mongol Invasions"). The notes for much of the second part of the chapter contain, in addition to documentation, extensive translations from the relevant Armenian sources

themselves. In this case, as in chapter one, it was deemed advisable to place special emphasis on the Armenian sources, which are simultaneously the least known and the most important for this study<sup>1</sup>.

The second aim of the study is to examine topically several aspects of the impact of the 13-14th century invasions on the Armenian lords of Greater Armenia. By way of introduction, chapter three begins with a discussion of who the lords (naxarars) were on the eve of the 13th century (during the so-called Zak'arid revival), and where their lands were located. The remainder of the chapter examines three questions: (1) how did the naxarars react to the Turco-Mongol invasions/migrations of the 13th century; (2) how did the Mongols (both before and after Islamization) attempt to control the naxarars, and finally, (3) what were the reactions of the naxarars to Mongol policies. The writing of this part of the study was facilitated first by the studies of Adontz, Manandyan, and Toumanoff, devoted to Armenia's social structure in earlier times (5-9th centuries). The many studies of Afak'elyan,

---

1

As a result, the information in chapter one on the Armenian sources serves as a preface to the translated portions of the sources appearing in chapters two and three which form an anthology of 13-14th century Armenian historical writings focussing on the Turco-Mongol invasions and domination(s) and the Armenian lords' reactions to them. It should be noted that while both Manandyan and Babayan conducted surveys of the Armenian sources, their reviews tend to be catalogues with little indication of a source's specific relevance. M. Abekyan's History of Ancient Armenia. Literature vol. 2 (Erevan, 1946) examined the literary (and often historical) importance of the 13-14th century sources. Thus

Babayan, Manandyan and Muşelyan, devoted to the 13-14th centuries were also very useful for questions pertaining to economic history. It should be stressed that this is not a study of 13-14th century Armenian society in its entirety, but rather of the lordly heads of that society in Greater Armenia. For questions concerning Armenia's peasants, and the complicated history of the Armenian Church in this period, the works of Manandyan, Babayan and Ormanian should be consulted.

The second part of the study, while drawing on the works of the above-mentioned scholars, is more than a synthesis. This is the first study of the 13-14th century lords which draws heavily on information found in the Georgian History of K'art'li. During the 13-14th centuries when Armenia was politically part of a Georgian state, many of its lords held important positions in the Georgian court (see chapter two and Appendix A for background). Much invaluable information on the lords is found in the History of K'art'li. Despite this, both Manandyan and (more surprisingly) Babayan relied on a brief Armenian abridgement of the History made by Melik'set'-bek which limits itself solely to "Armenia".

---

the survey of 13-14th century literary historians in chapter one below is the most extensive currently available.

This study, therefore, provides information unavailable elsewhere not only on the 13-14th century invasions, but also on their socio-political impact on Armenia's naxarars. Appendices B and C contain supplementary information on topics not examined by others, e.g., on the centrifugal forces operating within Armenian society, and on certain relations between the Mongols and the Armenian Church.

The transliteration systems followed here are the prevailing Hübschmann-Meillet system for Armenian, an adaptation of it for Georgian, and the system employed in volume 5 of the Cambridge History of Iran (the Saljuq and Mongol Periods) for Turkish and Mongolian. Double forms are utilized for localities which are identified in the sources by more than one name (e.g., Karin/Erzerum, Sebastia/Sīvās). Finally, to eliminate unnecessary confusion, and since this study focusses on Armenia, Georgian forms of proper names have been given in their Armenian equivalents (e.g., Šahnšah, not Šahnše; Zak'arē, not Zak'aria).

## CHAPTER THREE

ARMENIA'S LORDS AND THEIR REACTIONS TO THE  
TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND DOMINATION OF  
THE 13-14TH CENTURIES

This part of the study examines several aspects of the history of the lords or naxarars of Armenia in the 13-14th centuries: (1) who were the naxarars on the eve of the 13th century invasions (during the so-called Zak'arid revival) and where were their lands; (2) how did the naxarars react to the Turco-Mongol invasions/migrations of the 13th century; (3) how did the Mongols (both before and after Islamization) attempt to control the naxarars; and finally, (4) what were the reactions of the naxarars to Mongol policies?

Considerable debate exists among Armenists regarding many aspects of the history of Armenia's nobility. The derivation and thus the literal meaning of the term naxarar itself is debated<sup>1</sup>. The genesis of the naxarars too has been depicted differently by the foremost investigators of the institution or phenomenon of naxararism, by Nicholas Adontz, Hagop Manandyan, and Cyril

---

1

On the various derivations see Adontz, Armenia in the Period of Justinian, published originally in Russian in 1908, translated into English with extensive editorial remarks and notes by N.G. Garsoian (Lisbon, 1970) p.514 n. 44; also Anahit Perixanyan's "Drevnearmiatskie vostoniki [The ostanik's in Ancient Armenia]", VDI #2 (1956) pp. 49-50.

Toumanoff<sup>1</sup>. Most important, the essence of the term, its real rather than literal meaning has been perceived and described differently by these scholars<sup>2</sup>. Adontz,

---

1

Nicholas Adontz placed the disintegration of clan relationships in the time of political unrest in Armenia under Zariadris and Artaxias (second century B.C.), and the completion of this process during the reign of Tigran the Great (first century B.C.) at which time the greatest naxarar families, in his view, already had emerged (Adontz, pp. 307, 310, 315). Manandyan challenged this, suggesting that "a significant break in clan relationships and the growth in power and authority of clan leaders and chiefs had already occurred in this ancient [Urartian] period" (Manandyan, Trade, also Feudalism, pp. 250-51). It is important to observe (see note 2 below) that Manandyan was looking for the "emergence of feudalistic features" in Armenian society, automatically equating this with naxararism or "naxarar customs"---which to my knowledge he nowhere defines. Toumanoff places the appearance of dynasts before the creation of the Urartian state, styling them the "immemorial dynasts", Studies, pp. 50-52, 69, 74, 79, 136, and note 2 below.

2

Adontz, pp. 303-26 viewed the naxarars as descendants of tribal chieftains of different ethnic backgrounds who held power by right of birth. Manandyan (to the extent that it was and is possible given the scanty information available) focussed on the class position of the naxarars relative to the other classes in Armenian society. He, as many Soviet scholars, was eager to associate the naxarar "system" with Western European feudalism (See Manandyan, Trade, pp. 70-72; Feudalism, pp. 42-89; also B. Harut'yunyan's article "Feod-in ev beneficium-in hamapatasxanoh terminnere hay mjadaryan grakanut'van mel" [Terms Corresponding to Feod and Beneficium in Medieval Armenian Literature], Lraber #12 (1958) pp. 87--95, and the remarks of Sukiasian in the forward to his study on early "feudalism" in Armenia, Sukiasian pp. 15-27). Toumanoff, in his classic Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963) has reexamined the entire history of the Armenian highlands from Urartian times to the Bagratid period. Toumanoff considerably elaborated and took in new directions Adontz' recognition that the Armenian social system had a double aspect: one "feudal" and one dynastic (Studies, pp. 34-144, 154, 188). According to the author, the dynastic element pre-dated statehood (be it Urartian statehood, Arsacid or other) and consequently

Manandyan and Toumanoff likewise disagreed on the duration of the naxarar "system". Adontz wrote:

The naxarar system existed in Armenia from antiquity until the Mongol invasions. Like any institution developing in accordance with conditions of place and time, the naxarar system often changed in character and passed through several phases. <sup>1</sup>.

Manandyan hypothesized that the participation of the naxarars in the Mongols' many campaigns and the heavy taxes of the period combined to initiate the system's collapse<sup>2</sup>. The final liquidation of the system in his view came after the mid-fourteenth century, when Armenia became a battleground for numerous nomadic Turkic groups, though Manandyan noted certain "survivals" of "naxarar customs" in the inaccessible mountain regions of Eastern Armenia and Qarabagh<sup>3</sup>. Toumanoff wrote:

This social structure perished with the brutal Byzantine and Seljuq destruction of the Armenian polity in the eleventh century. Some vestiges of it, however, survived the catastrophe, both in Armenia and, through emigration, elsewhere. <sup>4</sup>.

---

regarded itself as equal to the monarch. One should consult the notes and appendices to Adontz provided by N. Garsoian, also the same author's recent "Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia", HA (1976) pp. 177-234, and also R. Hewsen's important tripartite study on the Meliks of Eastern Armenia (see Bibliography) on which see the conclusions of this study.

<sup>1</sup> Adontz, p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> Manandyan, Feudalism, pp. 255-56.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. p. 256.

<sup>4</sup> Studies, p. 144n. 262.



It is not our purpose here (and in any case it is beyond our present competence) to write the complex and often-changing history of Armenia's nobility from pre-Christian times to the 14th century. However, to place in sharper focus what is to be understood by the term naxarar in the 13-14th centuries, we shall contrast briefly the classical Arsacid (4-5th century) naxarar with his Zak'arid successor.

The socio-economic essence underlying the concept of the term naxarar underwent numerous changes from the 5th through the 13th centuries. The naxarar of the Zak'arid restoration differed fundamentally from the Arsacid lord. The Arsacid naxarar was the ancestral lord of clan domains which he did not personally own, and therefore could not alienate by sale or other means. If the truly great naxarar associated with the Armenian monarch, it was on terms of equality. As they never allowed their "natural lords" to forget, some of the grand naxarars descended from clans as old as, or older than, the Arsacids. For this reason, when naxarars accepted positions at the Arsacid Court, the act was usually a recognition on the king's part of the naxarar's right by birth and position to the office. The naxarar-doms tended to be self-sufficient economies, and trade in that period was of an international transit type through naxarar domains, of importance to the naxarars only due to the toll and customs revenue they could derive

from it. Their principal wealth was land, and the labor of dependent peasants living on that land<sup>1</sup>.

Quite different were the lords of the Zak'arid revival. The nobility of the early 13th century consisted of different elements. One substantial group included men of ambition and military talents from newly-arisen families, who were rewarded by their Zak'arid overlords with grants of land and/or the rights of administration (see below). Before and after receiving lands and villages, this category of 13th century lord derived much wealth from booty taken during military campaigns. Another element is referred to in the sources from the 12th century as mecatun, which means literally "of a great House". In fact, these were men of great financial wealth, who formed the upper class in the many Armenian cities which had recuperated from the Saljuq dislocations. These men too lacked antique pedigrees, and did not belong to the old naxarar families. Their wealth had been gained through trading and money-lending and, in contradistinction to the Arsacid lords who did not engage in trade, a substantial part of the mecatuns' assets were in cash. However, these merchants reinvested their capital in land, buying not only entire estates, but also shares of establishments (such as mills)<sup>2</sup>. An

---

1

See Adontz, Armenia pp. 289-371, and Toumanoff, Studies, pp. 33-144.

<sup>2</sup> HAP ch. 34, B.N.Afak'elyan, "Mecatunneri k'alak'avin vernaxavi jevavoruma[Formation of the Mecatun Urban Upper Stratum]" pp. 585-94.

inscription (1215) of one mecatun, Tigran, from the historically unknown family Honenc', on the wall of the church of St. Gregory in Ani, indicates the far-flung and multi-faceted nature of mecatun wealth<sup>1</sup>. From the inscription of another mecatun, we learn that ca. 1242 a certain Umek purchased the church of Getik for "40,000 red [gold] ducats", a currency which clearly indicates that such merchants as Umek were participating in the lucrative international trade with Italian city-states<sup>2</sup>.

The nobility of the Zak'arid period included descendants of the ancient dynastic families: Mamikonids, Bagratids, Arcrunids, Orbeleans, and others. In my opinion, by the 13th century these groups are probably best considered extended families rather than clans in the Arsacid sense. Nonetheless, dynasties as hoary as these (some of which by then were more than 13-centuries in duration) had a strong consciousness of their own past, which they knew from the ancient histories. Most likely these names commanded rather profound emotions among the Armenians, and their bearers probably possessed a certain status for sentimental reasons alone, not held by other segments of the nobility. Probable too is the existence within such families of certain ceremonies

1

VT pp. 58-59; Manandyan, Trade, pp. 185-86.

2

Manandyan, pp. 186-87.

rituals and regalia--especially within some of the Siwnik' and Xaçen dynasties--unshared by the merchants or Zak'arid warriors. Yet another segment of the Zak'arid nobility was composed of prominent clerics, representatives of various families, administering their family holdings as religious foundations (see below).

Nicholas Marr was of the opinion that in the immediately pre-Mongol and early Mongol periods the transfer of princely and noble estates into the hands of merchant-capitalists was taking place<sup>1</sup>. This is probably true. However, the tendency for urban merchants to invest in land, and the probably concomitant tendency for the landed naxarars to diversify into trade makes any drawing of lines impossible. Indeed, the new meaning of the term hayrenik' in this period reflects the same confusion. In the 5th and subsequent centuries hayrenik' referred to a lord's ancestral patrimony. It consisted of lands. But in the early 13th century, hayrenik' referred to both moveable and immoveable property, hereditary or purchased, and included money and shares in business enterprises as well<sup>2</sup>. Thus at the opening of the 13th century, the term naxarar had something of a catchall sense, exactly as the term melik did, two centuries later<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Manandyan, Trade, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> HAP pp. 554-55.

<sup>3</sup> R. Hews, "The Meliks of Eastern Armenia(I)", REA IX(1972) p.293

Unlike the territorial units of Arsacid Armenia studied by Adontz, which in some cases had been the possessions of different ethnic groups from time immemorial, the naxarardoms of the late 12th and 13th centuries were in many--though not all--cases the creations of the Zak'arid brothers, Zak'arē and Iwanē. The men chosen by the Zak'arids to administer and rule parts of northern and northeastern Armenia were not the elderly nahapets or the descendants of ancient tribal chieftains of Arsacid times who occupied office by right as much as by appointment. Rather, they were successful military commanders who had served under Zak'arē and Iwanē in the reclamation of Armenia from the Saljuqs. Many were men of ambition and action, lacking illustrious pedigrees. Frequently they were given charge of lands they themselves captured; often they were attached to the Zak'arids through marriage ties, as is illustrated below.

The properties under the overall jurisdiction of amirspasalar Zak'arē and later of his son Šahnšah were located in the northwestern parts of the reconquered lands: Lofi, Ani, Aragacotn, Bagrewand, Calkotn, Kogovit, Surmari, lands from the Virahayoc' mountains to the southern border of Calkotn, from Bolorpahakic' to Erewan. Ani was the center of this realm. Subject to Zak'arē's house were both newly-created families (such as the Vařuteans) and old naxarar families (such as the Pahlawunids,

Arcrunids, Mamikonids and others)<sup>1</sup>. The first of these families was founded by one Vaçe, a loyal follower of Zak'arē but of an unknown background, who was given by his lord all the districts of Aragacotn, Sirak, Nig and Amberd as far as Eraxajor<sup>2</sup>. He was made prince of princes of Zak'arē's realm. The Pahlawunids, ruling around Marmašen, Bagnayr and Lmbat, had acquired hereditary control over the office of bishop of Ani and Sirak, and occasionally were mayors of Ani<sup>3</sup>. The Arcrunids, who ruled the fortresses of Mahkanaberd and its environs north of Lake Sewan, were connected to the Zak'arids by marriage ties<sup>4</sup>. The Mamikonids held two small areas, one by Dseł, the other south of Gafni, around Urcajor<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP chp. 32, L.H. Babayan, "Zak'aryannerin ent'aka feodalakan tnere [Feudal Houses Subject to the Zak'arids]" p. 547.

<sup>2</sup> ibid.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. p. 548, also Appendix A.

<sup>4</sup> See below p. and also Appendix A.

<sup>5</sup> On the Mamikonids: H. Kurdian, "Mamikonanneri Dseł ğule [The Dseł Branch of the Mamikoneans]", Bazmavep (1956) pp. 155-62, 246-51; also A. Sahinyan, "Mamikonvan-Hamazaspyan tohme Hayastanum XII-XIII darerum [The Mamikonean-Hamazaspean Clan of Northern Armenia in the XII-XIII Centuries]" Iraber #3 (1968) pp. 84-93.

Under the jurisdiction of atabek Iwanē Zak'arean and later of his son Awag were the eastern areas: Bĭni, Gelark'unik', Vayoc' Jor, most of Arc'ax, Siwnik', Naxijewan, Dwin, and Erewan. The center of this realm was first Dwin and later Bĭni. Subject to Iwanē's house were the Orbēleans, Xalbakeans, Dop'eans and others<sup>1</sup>. The Orbēleans, who originally had been the Zak'arids' overlords in Georgia were, in the changed situation of the late 12th and 13th centuries their subordinates in Armenia. Around 1184 atabek Iwanē Zak'arean under authorization from the Georgian Crown granted to the successful general Liparit Orbēlean lands in eastern Vayoc' Jor, Kotayk', Gelark'unik' and Kayean<sup>2</sup>. Liparit married the daughter of the prince of princes of Siwnik' and became the founder of the Siwnik' Orbēlean line<sup>3</sup>. Another of Iwanē's subordinates was Vasak Xalbakean, originally from the Xaçen area, who had helped in the reconquest of Vayoc' Jor, Bĭni, and Dwin. As a reward he was given lands in western Vayoc' Jor, Šahapunik', Varažnunik' and parts of Kotayk' and Ayrarat. This family came to be known as Pfošean after Vasak's energetic

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 548.

<sup>2</sup> SO pp. 142-43.

<sup>3</sup> SO p. 144. On the Orbēleans see also R.Hewsen, "The Meliks" REA #XI (1975/76 pp. 220-24.

son, Pfoš (1223-84)<sup>1</sup>. Another small branch of the Zak'arids descended from Zak'arē's and Iwanē's first cousin (father's brother's son) also named Zak'arē, ruled lands in Tawuš, P'afisos and Gardman. The center of its realm was Gag fortress. This line became known as Vahramean after Zak'arē Gageli's son, Vahram of Gag<sup>2</sup>.

A number of new and old naxarar families became associated with the Zak'arids through marriage alliances with three of Zak'arē's and Iwanē's sisters. Their sister Vaneni was married to Abas II Kiwrikan of Macnaberd<sup>3</sup>; Dop'i married Hasan, prince of the old naxarardom of Arc'ax in eastern Armenia, receiving as dowry a large area on the southern shore of Lake Sewan and Sot'k' district in Siwnik'. Her descendants are known as the Dop'eank'<sup>4</sup>. Xorišah Zak'arean, another sister, was

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Yovsēp'ean, Xaibakeank' kam Prošeank' (Antelias, 1969, repr. of 1928 ed. with additional collected articles) pp. 10, 14. Hereafter, X. On the Xaibakids, also R. Hewsén, "The Meliks"(III), REA XI(1975/76) pp. 225-26.

<sup>2</sup> HAP ch . 32, L.H. Babayan, "Zak'aryan erek' išanut'yunneri kazmayorum" [The Formation of the Three Zak'arid Princedoms] p. 541.

<sup>3</sup> On the Kiwrikanes: L.Movsēsean, "Histoire des rois Kurikian de Lori", P.Macler, trans. REA(1927) pp. 253-55, 266.

<sup>4</sup> On the Dop'eans: G.E. Kirakosyan, "Matenagitakan telekut'-yunneri Dop'yanneri masin" [Bibliographical information on the Dop'eans] "PBH #1 (1969) pp. 217-26; also R. Hewsén, "The Meliks"(II) REA X (1973/74) pp. 289-90.



married to Vart'ang lord of Xaçen district. The family was named after Hasan Jalal, the issue of this union. The Hasan Jalaleans ruled southern Xaçen<sup>1</sup>.

In the early 13th century the Zak'arids had influence in southern Armenia too, though how much and how deeply it was felt cannot be ascertained clearly. As a result of his carelessness on a campaign against Xlat' in 1209/10, atabek Iwanē was captured by the Muslim lord of that city. Among the terms stipulated for Iwanē's release was the hand of his daughter T'amt'a. T'amt'a was married to Melik Ashraf of Xlat', and became the real ruler of parts of the Shāh-Armen state during periods of dislocation, from 1212 to 1231<sup>2</sup>. Another Armenian "state" existed in the Van area, centered mostly at Alt'amar, but probably possessing property in the numerous Armenian cities under its spiritual jurisdiction, i.e., in the cities surrounding Lake Van: Berkri, Arčēš, Aroke, Xlat', Hizan, etc. This was the religio-political entity known as the kat'olikosate (or anti-kat'olikosate) of Alt'amar, a creation of the Arcrunids<sup>3</sup>. This surrogate state existed in addition to

---

<sup>1</sup> I.A.Orbeli, h'Asan Dzhalal kniaz' Khachenskii [Hasan Jalal, Prince of Xaçen] Izvestiia Imp.AN (St. Petersburg, 1909); also R.Hewsen, "The Meliks" (II) pp. 288-89.

<sup>2</sup> See ch. 2 p.

<sup>3</sup> When in 1021 king Senek'erim Arcruni of Vaspurakan exchanged his lands for lands in Byzantine Cappadocia, "he

an Arcrunid-Mamikonid mountain naxarardom in Sasun, to the west. Furthermore, the brothers Zak'arē and Iwanē (and also T'amt'a) were themselves of Arcrunid background. Their mother was Sahakduxt, daughter of Sadun I Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli<sup>1</sup>. The existence of such families, whose properties and political-spiritual-financial jurisdiction embraced large parts of the Armenian highlands on the one hand must have presented unique opportunities for trade and more intimate ties. On the other hand, it provided unlimited opportunities for intra-family and inter-family conflicts<sup>2</sup>.

---

did not give [emperor] Basil the monasteries, so that they would remain free and pray for Senek'erim and his son. There were 115, or some say 900 monasteries"(SA p. 104). An Arcrunid counter-kat'olikosate was established at Ait'amar in the early 12th century, and existed until the 20th century, much to the chagrin of Sis and Ejmiacin, other centers of the Church of Armenia. See N. Akinean, "Ait'amaray kat'olikosac' gawazanagirk'e" [The Succession of the Kat'olikoi of Ait'amar] HA (1916) p. 145, 148. Curiously, Akinean omits reference to the passage in SA.

1

X p. 7.

2

See Appendices A and B.

## The Naxarars and the Invasions of the Early 13th Century

Of the various Turco-Mongol invasions occurring in the 1220's and 1230's, the most destructive were those undertaken by Jalāl al-Dīn Mangūbirdī of Khwarazm and by the Mongols. How did the naxarars react to them, and how did the new conquerors of Armenia deal with the naxarars? According to Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Step'annos Orbēlean and the History of K'art'li, the Armeno-Georgian army commanded by atabek Iwanē outnumbered Jalāl al-Dīn's force. But naxarar squabbles and jealousies appear to have been an important cause of defeat. Some sources politely and piously speak of divine intervention which managed to change the shouted command "charge" into "flee"<sup>1</sup>. In fact, because of enmity between the atabek Iwanē and his relations Iwanē and Šalva (Vahram Gageli's first cousin), the atabek Iwanē refused to participate or to allow those troops under him to fight. Other detachments under lesser commanders fled or fought chaotically<sup>2</sup>. Following their desertion, the prominent naxarars withdrew to the security of their inaccessible fortresses<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> SO p. 145.

<sup>2</sup> See ch. 2 pp. 81-82 n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> KC p. 180; Mur. p. 68: "...Now the mandat'urt'-uxuc'es Šahnsah was in Ani, the amirspasalar Awag was in Bjni, while Vahram Gageli, the people of Heret'i, Kaxet'i, Somxit'i, K'art'li, Toreli, Shavshet'i, Klarjet'i and Tao were all fortified into their keeps, each of them loyal to Rusudan's rule, but due to their preoccupation, they were unable to participate in the ceremony for king David".

Jalāl al-Dīn's destructive activities in Armenia and Georgia hardly can be considered a strategy to win popular support. Jalāl himself was a desperate fugitive from the Mongols. He did, however, entertain hopes of creating a state in his conquered areas, and, as Kirakos noted, he did establish an administration of sorts in Ganjak<sup>1</sup>. In those areas where Muslim enclaves lived surrounded by Christian majorities--Tiflis, for example--he was able to rely on Muslims as a base of support. Kirakos and the History of K'art'li both state that Jalāl was able to capture Tiflis with the complicity of resident Persians who opened the city gates and regarded him as their liberator<sup>2</sup>. However areas ruled by Muslims regarded him and his uncontrollable Turkmen warriors as a danger, and allied to fight him<sup>3</sup>. Jalāl al-Dīn was not unaware of the Caucasian nobility. According to Kirakos, when he captured Xlat' on the northeastern shore of Lake Van, he married that city's figurehead ruler, Iwanē's daughter T'amt'a Zak'arean<sup>4</sup>. According to the History of K'art'li, Jalāl also hoped to marry the queen of Georgia, Rusudan, and even urged Awag to serve as match-maker, but Rusudan

---

<sup>1</sup> KG pp. 226-27.

<sup>2</sup> KG p. 226; KC pp. 175-77; Mur. pp. 64-65.

<sup>3</sup> KC p. 182; Mur. pp. 69-70.

<sup>4</sup> KG p. 228.

was unwilling<sup>1</sup>.

The Armenian and Georgian sources tend to combine into one account events from the first and second Mongol invasions, of 1220/21 and of 1236. Naxarar reaction seemingly was quite similar on both occasions, and almost identical with the reaction to Jalāl al-Dīn. Some of the Armeno-Georgian forces fought, while others deserted and took refuge in their strongholds. Dissension and rivalries among the resisting troops are reported by the sources<sup>2</sup>. Despite the numerical superiority of the Armeno-Georgian army, the Mongols were disciplined fighters. Their adversaries were not.

---

<sup>1</sup> KC pp. 173-74; Mur. pp. 63-64.

<sup>2</sup> GA pp. 292,294: "...When the news of the coming of the Tat'ars was learned, Iwane took the cavalry of the Georgian kingdom and came to Gag, to the great and wise prince Varham [Gageli], son of Plu Zak'are. Taking him with his own army, he went against the Tat'ars. The mighty and great prince Varham took the right wing and Iwane the left ...When the battle was joined, through the influence of Satan, the enemy of Truth, Hamidawla, the lord of Manasa stable, because of some grudge, hamstrung the horse of At'abak Iwane. When the Nation of the Archers saw such dissension amongst them, they grew stronger and attacked the Georgian cavalry, mercilessly killing them".

Whatever the true sequence of events, by 1236, when the Mongols attacked the Caucasus a second time, bringing along sophisticated Chinese siege machinery<sup>1</sup>, the Caucasian nobles had no intention of joint military resistance. Kirakos wrote:

...And since [the nobles] were unable to withstand that great blizzard [of Mongols] which had come, they all betook themselves to fortresses wherever they were able. The Mongols spread throughout the plains, mountains, and valleys like a multitude of locusts or like torrential rains pouring down on the land. 2.

The queen of Georgia and Vahram of Gag fled to northwestern Georgia; Šahnšah fled to Ačaria; and Awag secured himself into fort Kayean<sup>3</sup>. Not only did the naxarars not fight,

<sup>1</sup> KG pp. 236, 241, 250.

<sup>2</sup> KG pp. 238-39: "Ew oč ēin karol zdem unel anhnarin bk'ovn ekelov, vas n avsořik aninapah ēlen amenek ean zayt aktealk, vamroc, and ereša nstac, ieranc. Ew qok a.sp. tealk at hasarak kam ibrew zanjrew yordut eamb teleal i veray erkri".

<sup>3</sup> KC p. 187; Mur. p. 73.

but at least in one instance, the population of a city (Samk'or) belonging to Vahram of Gag, was forbidden to resist, by Vahram himself<sup>1</sup>.

---

1

KG p.241-2:"One of the nobles, named Molar noyin, whose lot had fallen over those regions, while they moved from their abode in the Mughan plain, sent a small force of about 100 men who came and encamped by the city of Samk'or, and blocked the entrance to and exit from it". This city belonged to Vahram and his son Aibula who had taken it from the Persians. When the residents sent to Vahram for protection the latter refused and forbade them to resist. "The foreigners' army increased daily until their commander Molar arrived and fought against the city. He filled the trench which surrounded the city walls with wood and stalks, so that they might easily climb onto the walls. But the people threw fire down at night and burned the filler. Now in the morning when Molar noyin saw that, he ordered each of his soldiers to bring a load of soil and to throw it into the trench. When this was done the area became level with the walls.

"Then each soldier applied himself to that part of the city directly in front of him. And they took it, killed all the inhabitants, burned the buildings and took whatever they found there. They then fell upon other fortresses under Vahram's sway: Terunakan, Ergevank, Macnaberd (which belong to Kiwrike Bagratuni, Aisartan's son), Gardman, and other regions [such as] Çarenk'. And another chief named Latalan noyin went to Getabak. Now Vahram who was then in Gardman, secretly fled at night to wherever he was able. Meanwhile the army of foreigners battled with the fortresses. Those inside them unwillingly provided the Mongols with horses, livestock and whatever else they demanded. The Mongols placed taxes over them and left them...

"But those who took Samk'or had come with all their baggage to Tawus, Kacaret', Norberd, Gag and the surrounding areas. Placing these regions in great straits, they besieged them" (KG p. 242). See also KC pp. 186-87; Mur. pp. 72-73.

The common danger posed by the Mongols proved insufficient to unite the naxarars. The History of K'art'li describes the situation obtaining in Christian Caucasia on the eve of the princes' surrender:

When the country was subjected to such bitterness and wicked acts, the powerful erist'avs of erist'avs and the veziers rose up against each other and became each other's murderers. For queen Rusudan was entirely settled on the far side of the Lixt mountains and was unable to cross to this side of Lixt; nor were the veziers on this side able to go to her, having no chance. They became wanderers. So they were disunited and imprudent. Thus Georgia's powerful and renowned ones became unable to fight the Tatars to save themselves. 1.

When the naxarars realized the futility of resistance they began surrendering. The Mongols richly rewarded those submitting--an inducement to the hesitant--while simultaneously devastating the lands of recalcitrant lords. They demanded taxes, appointed guards for key areas, demolished the walls encircling fortresses which they considered potential bases of local resistance<sup>2</sup>, and required the naxarars and their troops to participate in the subjugation of other areas. Frequently they obliged the Caucasians to fight as advance-attackers, to prevent their desertion<sup>3</sup>.

---

1 KC pp. 188-89; Mur. p. 74.

2 KG pp. 237, 241, 313; GA p. 297.

3 The Armenian and Georgian princes' submission to the



Mongols is recounted variously by the different sources. KG's account begins in chp. 26, "Concerning Prince Awag's Fall into the Hands of the Tatars". Awag, at the time was holed up in Kayean fortress where he, and many inhabitants of the district had sought refuge. "The land filled with the troops of foreigners...They settled around all sides of the wall at the base of the fortress and sent messages to Awag to come out to them obediently in service and not to be afraid. Many times they sent to him saying the same thing. Now Awag, desiring to win their approval, gave over to the Tatars his daughter and many goods, so that perhaps they would lift the siege. But they took his gifts and still more insistently demanded his presence". The besieged suffered from thirst. "So they gave over to the Tatars their horses and all their livestock, so that they allow some of them to go and bring water for their animals. Undertaking their plan in a body of many men, they went to the water source there. The Tatars blocked their path to the water. They killed no one, but told them to lower down their families and to live among them. Unwillingly and in grief, they brought down their families. They drank water and were kept among the Tatars. The Tatars took the women they wanted and killed their men, leaving others without their husbands.

"As soon as Awag saw that the Tatars did not let off besieging or destroying them, he wished to surrender so that perhaps things would be lighter for the people. So he sent Grigor called Tlay ['lad'] with flatteries. He was one of the Xaŋen azats, the superintendent of Awag's home. [Grigor] was sent in advance of Awag, to go and meet with their leader Chormaghun who had pitched his tent by the shores of lake Geŋark unik [Sewan]. When the great noyin Chormaghun heard this, he was delighted and sent immediately to Itulata, who was besieging Kayean, to speedily come to him and no longer harry the inhabitants of the fortress and district. Itulata took Awag and quickly came to Chormaghun. When Chormaghun saw the prince, he said to him: 'Are you Awag'? The prince replied: 'I am he'. The great commander then asked: 'Why did you not come quickly to me when I entered the boundaries of your land'? The prince responded: 'While you were far away, and my father was living, he served you with many gifts (pataragok). As soon as my father died, I served you according to my capability. And now that you have come to my land, lo, I have come before you. Do with me what you will'. [To my knowledge no explanation has as yet been offered for this curious passage-RB]...[Chormaghun] further ordered all of his troops not to fight with the fortresses and cities under Awag's domination. And great ease came about in his land and many captives among the azats were freed because of him. And Chormaghun gave him all of his land and more besides and established unbreakable friendship with him. Taking Awag and all his troops, Chormaghun marched against the city of Ani" (KG pp. 255-57).

Awag then visited the Khān in Qara Qorum. "When he came back to his land and the commanders implemented the orders of their king, the following men came to the Tatars in service: Sahnsah, son of Zak'are; prince Vahram and his son Albuka; Hasan called Jalal, prince of the Xaḡen area, and many others. The Tatars gave to each one control over his lands and for the time being, a pardon" (KG p. 263).

In ch. 30, Kirakos describes the conquest of Xaḡen, where many people fled to the inaccessible fortress called Hawaxalac ("Perch"). This fortress was taken and its people killed. The Mongols also went against prince Hasan Jalal, the son of the sister of Zak'are and Iwanē, who holed up with the population under him in the fortress "which is called Xoxanaberd in Persian. When the Tatars arrived to seize the fortress, they saw that it was not possible to take it. So they called Jalal to them, amicably. And he wisely pleased them. Later, he himself went to them with many presents. The Tatars honored him and gave him back his land and other lands besides, and ordered him to come to them each year for war service, and ingenuously to be obedient to them" (KG p. 269).

According to VA, following the taking of Samk'or by the Mongols, Vahram of Gag and his son Albuka fled from place to place "until they learned that the Tatars spared those people who voluntarily subordinated themselves to them. Then they [Vahram and his son] went and received back from the Tatars those castles and districts they had captured, which were their sep'akan patrimony (hayrenik). All of them were taken: Tawus, Kacaret', Terunakan, Ergevank', Macnaberd which was [the property] of Asxart'an Kiwrikan, Norberd, [the property] of the royal (tāḡaworazn) Vasak; and the impregnable fortress K'awazin; the renowned fortress of Gag and the district built up by king Gagik... Everything was surrendered to them in a short period without toil or labor. For we knew that it was the Hand of the Lord, which, before our very eyes, had given over our land as food for the foreigners" (VA p. 145).

SO: "When the Tatars first came to this land, our districts fell the lot (bažin) of Aslan novin. Elikum [Orbelean] was holed up with his people in the impregnable fortress of Hraškaberd. That Aslan came and circumscribed the fortress and realized that it was humanly impossible to take it. So he encamped opposite the fortress and sent messages to Elikum, saying: 'Make friends with us; come to us, and you will find many benefits from us. Otherwise, no matter how long you sit on your rock, we shall not quit this land. For God has given us this [land] as patrimony, and when you come forth, it will be the ruin of you and your tun (House)'.

"When Elikum heard this, he did not reject the advice, but instead, replying sweetly, he requested an oath. And he went before [Aslan] with numerous gifts. When Aslan saw this, he liked Elikum greatly and received him and made peace" (SO p. 149).

GA: "Thereafter when the wise princes of Armenia and Georgia realized that God had given power and victory to [the Mongols] to take our lands, they then became reconciled, and became obedient to the Tatars and promised to give the taxes, i.e., the mal and t'alar, and to come out to them with their cavalry wherever they led them. The Tatars, agreeing to this, ceased their killing and destroying the land, and themselves returned to their place, the country of Mughan. But they left a chief named Lara Bula to demolish all the fortresses which they had taken. They destroyed to the foundations the impregnable fortresses built by the Tačiks at great cost. This all came to pass" (GA p. 297).

KC: "When atabek Iwane's son, the amirspasalar Awag saw these crimes, he sent emissaries to Partaw, where the above-mentioned novins had encamped for the winter. The latter passed the summer in the mountains of Gelark'unik and Ayrarat, for at that time, Chormaghun had taken Ani. Awag sent to them emissaries, seeking reconciliation. He promised to go to see them, to serve and to pay taxes, for the preservation of his country; he demanded an oath and assurances. They were delighted and accepted Awag's emissary with affection and swore a firm oath.

"...When Awag's emissaries returned and relayed to him all that happened, spasalar Awag went to them, having staked his soul for his lands. He went to Chormaghun, Chaghatai, Baiju and Yusur, who saw and honored him, became intimately acquainted, and appointed guards for [his] cities. In their language these are called gan.

"Awag's land was thus pacified. When the mandat'urt -- uxuc'es Sahnšah was informed of the reconciliation between Awag and the Tatars, he too wanted to keep his country safely, in peace, and unharmed. He told Awag to notify them that he wanted to go to see the Tatars. The Tatars were informed and agreed to it with joy, and for this too they also swore the golden oath of assurance. Sahnšah also went and saw them. They similarly honored him greatly and returned to him Ani and the land of his they had taken, in its entirety. Then they appointed guards for the interior of the country. They received with honor all the Georgian princes who came [to them] while they ravaged the lands of the disobedient. When Zak'are's son, Vahram Gageli was informed of this, he too sought refuge [with the Tatars]. With reconciliation accepted, his lands too were pacified... However Heret'i and Kaxet'i, Somxit'i and K'art'li and above as far as the city of Karin (Erzerum) were undergoing bitter destruction... [The Mongols] enslaved and raided K'art'li, Samc'xe, Java-xet'i, and above as far as Greece (=Rum), Kaxet'i, and Heret'i as far as Darband.

"Forced to this fate by chastisements, all the princes of Georgia, the people of Her-Kaxet'i, of K'art'li, Toreli -- Gamrkeli, Sargis T'mogveli an educated and virtuous man, sought refuge with the Tatars, while the Meschs, for the dignity of queen Rusudan did not submit". Chaghatai, enraged,

Indeed, it was during such Mongol campaigns--be they in the as yet unsubdued areas of eastern Armenia, or in those areas of western Armenia under Saljuqid rule--that the naxarars had the opportunity to display their martial prowess, their loyalty, and their greed. For there was much booty to be had, and this naturally appealed to the naxarars. Thus (in 1236) did the atabek Awag participate in the sack of Ani (the property of his cousin Šahnšah) and the looting of its churches<sup>1</sup>. The city of Karin/Erzerum was sacked in 1242<sup>2</sup>. The naxarars are reported to have been

---

invaded Samc'xe and devastated it. "When there was no strength left, Iwane C'ixisjvarel-Jaqeli, who was also called Ivarivare, appealed to queen Rusudan, at her agreement, for him also to seek protection with Chaghatai, to free the country from destruction. He [first bothered to ask her permission] because he was the mečurčlet-uxuc'es and the prince of Samc'xe. The queen agreed and sent him. Then Iwane went and met Chaghatai who received him with honor and appointed guards for the country" (KC pp. 189-91; Mur. pp. 74-76).

1  
KG pp. 257-60.

2  
KG p. 279: "...And at that time the city was heavily populated, being filled not only with Christians and Tačiks, but all the people from the entire district had assembled there. In the city were countless holy gospels [belonging to] the great and the lowly. The foreigners took them and sold the expensive ones to the Christians in their army, cheaply. In glee they spread through each district, dividing up the churches and monasteries". However, to the credit of the princes, KG notes "May Christ reward the Christian princes Awag, Šahnšah, Vahram's son, Albula, pious Dop's son, Grigor Xaçenc'i, and their troops. For these princes bought out of slavery as many men, women, and children, bishops priests and deacons as was possible..." (KG p. 280). GA pp. 307, 309: "...Then the Armenian and Georgian princes took [away] many books, heortologia, martyrologia, the Apostolic works, lectionaries, Acts, and the Gospels written in gold, richly adorned beyond comparison for the edification and adornment of the sons of the new

enriched specifically after crushing the Saljuqid sultan of Rūm, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai Khusrāu near Erzincan (1243/44)<sup>1</sup>. Even when the sources do not specifically mention it, the naxarars, if not the common soldiers ordinarily received some share of the booty during the Mongol campaigns. Aknerc'i's account of the naxarars' behavior in the city of Mayyāfārikīn/Tigranakert (which was starved into submission) probably was typical of the naxarars' actions elsewhere in western Armenia<sup>2</sup>.

---

Zion. Whence they took and brought them to the eastern country and filled the monasteries with all the adornments of the Church".

1

KC p. 194; Mur. p. 78: "The Georgians and Tatars swelled up with all sorts of treasures: gold and silver, gold and silver cups and bowls, extraordinary cloths and clothing and so many horses, asses and camels that it is impossible to count them".

2

GA pp. 334, 336: "...The Armenian troops there with the Tat'ars found many relics of the saints and took them to their land. Now the great prince of Armenia named T'aleadin, from the Bagratuni family, seized a Syrian presbyter and made him confess that he had found the right [hand] of the blessed apostle Bartholomew. With great joy [T'aleadin] took it to his eastern land and put it in his monastery. Afterwards, forced by the great Arcrunid prince named Sadun, he gave it to him. Sadun, lord of Haibat's great and renowned holy congregation had the blessed right hand of apostle Bartholomew placed in the holy congregation of Haibat. And it is in fact there".

## Mongol Control Techniques in the 13th Century

The Mongols dealt with the Caucasian nobility in a number of time-honored ways: through the manipulation of naxarar precedence and the co-optation of allegiance; and through de-naxararization. Given the normal rivalries and antagonisms among the lords (see below, Appendix B), the manipulation of naxarar precedence was made quite simple. The Mongols, before conquering a particular region (such as the Caucasus) always divided up by lots among their generals the area to be taken<sup>1</sup>. The naxarars, upon surrendering to them, became the clients of the particular Mongol general conquering that territory. The immediate effect of this was to distort and partially destroy the nexus of political (and of course, military) ties which had existed between the nobles and the Georgian Crown.

---

<sup>1</sup> KG pp. 237-38; VA p. 144; SO p. 149. From Kirakos' narration it is clear that during the conquest of Armenia, the Mongols had a fairly clear understanding of the relative importance of prince Awag [KG p. 256]. Somewhat annoyed by Awag's slowness in submitting, the Mongol noyin Chormaghun showed his displeasure in an episode regarding seating precedence. See KG pp. 256-57.

In theory as well as in practice, the Mongols regarded all conquered lands as their own property. They did not hesitate to favor submissive princes or punish the recalcitrant by giving lands or taking them away. The Mongols were adroit at exploiting antagonisms existing within branches of the same family. Thus, when Awag (ca. 1243), harried by the Mongols' excessive demands, fled to the court of queen Rusudan (herself a fugitive from the Mongols), Kirakos noted that the Mongols gave his land to Šahnšah because of the latter's greater faithfulness<sup>1</sup>. Another striking example of precedence manipulation within a single family concerns the Georgian royal Bagratids themselves. The Mongol commander Baiju furious with Rusudan for not surrendering to him, enthroned her co-opted son, David Rusudanean<sup>2</sup>. Eventually sanctioning two monarchs, the Mongols effectively divided the kingdom and the royal treasury, expropriating one third of it for themselves<sup>3</sup>. But following Rusudan's death (ca. 1247) and before the enthronement of the two rulers, the Mongols again manipulated the precedence of the lords to suit their principal aim, namely of encouraging centrifugation. The History of K'art'li, after noting Georgia's rulerless condition, continues:

---

<sup>1</sup> KG p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> KG p. 289. Also see Appendix B.

<sup>3</sup> KG p. 317.

Consequently, each one [prince] arranged matters individually and concerned himself with his own affairs. Each prince attached himself to a novin and the Tatars appointed a Ten Thousander officer for them, whom they called dumnāpet. Princes were chosen by them [the Mongols]. First was Egarslan Bakurc'ixeli, a very eloquent man, but not one with a respect-worthy behavior. They bestowed on him the army of Heret'i, Kaxet'i, and Kamcechovani above to Tiflis and to Mt. Samaxi. They entrusted to Sahnšah his own and Awag's properties; to Varham Gageli all of Somxit'i; to Grigor Surameli, K'art'li; to Torel-Gamrekeli, [still] a youth like Egarslan, Javaxet'i, Samc'xe, and above to the city of Karin; to C'otne Dadiani and the duke of Rač [Kaxaberi, father of Gonc'a Kaxaberije-Awagean], all of the kingdom on the other side. 1.

Prior to the return of Awag and the two Davids from a sojourn in the Far East, Egarslan Bakurc'ixeli's power was permitted to grow, until:

...he became so very powerful that he almost dared to be called king. The entire Georgian people was subject to his command, as to a king's including the great and honorable mandat'urt'--uxuc'es Sahnšah, Varham Gageli, and all the other princes. 2.

Upon Awag's return from the Far East, Egarslan was expelled from the country, as the Mongols looked on approvingly<sup>3</sup>. In the late 1250's, the Mongols attempted to elevate Sargis Jaqeli-C'ixisjvareli for saving Hülegü-Khān's life during battle. Their actions, and the reaction of the Georgian Crown show very well the divisiveness engendered by Mongol policy:

---

1 KC pp. 207-8; Mur. pp. 87-88.

2 KC p. 212; Mur. p. 90.

3 KC p. 225; Mur. p. 100.



...Now [the Khan] gave to king David and his soldiers great honor and numerous gifts, so much so that he granted by yarligh the city of Karin and the surrounding lands to Sargis Jaqeli.

At that time some foes envied [Sargis] and said to the king: 'Now why do you not give Sargis your kingdom, too, since the Khan has strengthened him so much that he will no longer be subject to your rule'. The king believed this, because he was untried and credulous of both good and evil words. At night he went to the noyin and explained: 'If the Khan gives Sargis the city of Karin, he also gives the kingdom'. Elgon noyin was astonished and replied: 'The Khan gave it [to him] because of his activity with you, but if it bothers you, he will not give it. In battle you Georgians do nothing good for the brave warriors. Don't you know that Sargis saved the Khan from the enemy, and offered a tough and noteworthy fight?'

The noyin went and informed the Khan of the entire conversation, and [as a result] he did not give the city of Karin. When Sargis heard about this he was stunned and grumbled against his lord. That winter the king was kept in Partaw while the disgruntled Sargis went to Samc'xe. 1.

In the 1260's and 1270's the Mongols furthered the territorial and political ambitions of the Orbeleans and the Arcrunid/Mahkanaberdelis, at the expense of the Zak'arids and Georgian Bagratids, but as is noted (Appendix B) the consistent contradictions in the sources obscure the picture somewhat. Finally, at the end of the 13th century

---

1

KC p. 250; Mur. p. 122. Subsequently king David imprisoned Sargis, but Abaqa-Khan ordered his release. The KC adds: "From this point on, the Jaqelis became loyal to Hülegü" (KC p. 255; Mur. p. 127; also KC p. 297; Mur. p. 164).

and the beginning of the 14th, the Mongols elevated a Jaqeli to the throne<sup>1</sup>.

Another method of manipulating naxarar precedence involved detaching certain prominent princes from economic and political connection with the Georgian Crown(s). The best known example of this involves the Armenian Orbēleans of Siwnik'. Smbat Orbēlean was granted injū status in 1252 on a trip to the Far East:

...[Möngke-Khān] readily accepted these words [of counsel] and then entrusted Smbat to his mother named Suraxt'ambek, saying: 'This particular ark'ayun we shall keep for ourselves and not allow any other [person] authority over him'. And they styled him enču, that is, teruni. They ordered him to remain at court for some days and instructed the officials to provide him with a daily stipend from the court...Furthermore they removed Smbat['s name] from the dawt'ars of the Georgians and others. 2.

Another prince who apparently received injū status was Hasan Jalal. Around 1257, Hasan accompanied the new Khān of the North, Sartakh, on a trip to the Great Khān

<sup>1</sup> KC p. 324; Mur. pp. 187-88.

<sup>2</sup> SO pp. 155, 157: "Orum yovž hawaneal ew mtadiwrut'eamb enkaleal zbanšn apa tay zSmbat morn iwroy ew yanine nma, orum anun Suraxt'ambek kočiwr, ew ase. zays mī ark ayuns mez pahesc uk ew oč tac uk avl umek ičxel i veray dora. Ew anuanec in zna Enču, avsink'n teruni. ew hramayec, in kal i drann awurs inč. ew yaninec in gorcakalac n tal or est ore yark unust, zročikn...Ew ehan zSmbat i durs yamenayn dawt'arac i Vrac ew yayloc'."

Möngke:

...With Sartakh was the pious prince of Xaçen, Jalal, who had gone to reveal to his supreme lord the diasters he had borne from governor Arghun, from whom he had barely escaped death, thanks to the Tačiks. And he gave him a document [entitling him] to rule his principedom independently, and to fear no one. For Sartakh liked Jalal on account of the prince's Christianity, since he too was Christian. 1.

Apparently, around 1273 Sargis Jaqeli also received injü status<sup>2</sup>. During the same decade the cities of Kars, T'elavi, Belak'an "and many other lands" were separated from royal control and given by the Mongols to Sadun Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli<sup>3</sup>.

1

KG p. 373: "End nma ēr ew barepašt iṣxann Xaçenoy Jalaln, or ert'eal er c'uc'anel zalets iwr teafnn tiezerac, \_zor kreac na vArlun oštikanen, or haziw zercaw, i mahuanen i sadreloy tačkac n. Ew et nma gir iṣxanut ean iwroy tirel sep akanabar ew q'erknčel yumek'e, zi sirer zna Sart axn vasn k ristoneut ean, zi ew na k ristoneay er".

2

KC pp. 270-71; Mur. pp. 140-41: "Then all the didebuls of Georgia assembled and took the royal Demitre to the Horde. They went to Sahnšah's son, Iwane, the mandat'urt'--uxuc'es, and he too went to the Horde where they saw to it that Demitre received the reign...[Abaqa] gave the entire kingdom to him, excepting the lands of Sargis Jaqeli. He sent him to Sadun whom king Demitre made atabek...[Speaking of the Pervane's replacement as ruler of Rum]: To him they entrusted the principedom of Rum, including Aclur and Samc'xe which had belonged to the Pervane from his [Georgian] wife's dowry, and they bestowed on him Sargis Jaqeli and his son Beka". See also KC p. 297; Mur. p. 164.

3

KC p. 272; Mur. p. 142.

Co-optation of allegiance, a corollary of the manipulation of naxarar precedence, occurred as a natural consequence of Mongol policies. This involved more than simply the extension of one lord's boundaries at the expense of another's. The Mongols attempted to incorporate certain prominent naxarars into their own court and administration, and thereby created conflicts of loyalty. They further sought to bind naxarars to themselves by providing them with Mongol wives. The source mentions such co-optation beginning after 1256, the year in which Hūlegū became Il-Khān in Iran:

When Hūlegū saw the Georgian nobility which had come before him, received them affectionately and armed [them] to take them to battle with him. Some he appointed as uldač, that is, sword-bearing palace guards; some were designated sak'urč, that is, those who hold above the Khan's head a parasol with a rounded end, like a flag; and only those from the Khan's relatives had the right to fan; others were appointed lubčaq--keepers of the wardrobe and shoes (basmat); others, evd[alrč, bodyguards; and one group also was designated lorč--holders of arrows and quivers. Thus did the Khan bestow these mean honors on the great princes of Georgia, and he considered each honored.

1.

---

1  
KC pp. 222-23; Mur. p. 98. Aknerc'i wrote: "Hūlegū--Khan greatly loved the Armenian and Georgian forces because of the extreme bravery which they displayed before him in all battles. Therefore he called them Bahaturs. He selected the young and handsome sons of the great princes of Armenia and Georgia and appointed them as his guards, styling them K'esikt'oyk'--guards with sword and bow" (GA p. 342). The Mongols also tried--obviously with limited success--to co-opt the allegiance of king David Lašaeen. From Batu-Khan of the Northern Tatars, David received "a parasol (suk'ur) which no one excepting the Khans and their relations have. [Batu] told Hūlegū that

Some naxarars--notably those enjoying injū status-- became pillars of Mongol administration in the Caucasus. Smbat Orbēlean and Sadun Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli are particularly good examples. In the early 1260's Smbat was deputized Hūlegū's overseer of construction for the new Īl-Khānid summer residence of Ala-Tagh to the east of Lake Van<sup>1</sup>. Step'annos added:

...Hūlegu so heeded his words that [Smbat] could have killed whomever he chose, or granted life to whomever he wanted. Consequently, everyone quaked with fear because of him, and everyone's eyes were upon him. 2.

---

with the exception of Hūlegū noyin himself, when entering the Horde, no one should stand higher than the [Georgian] king...After the king reached his holdings, he went with great gifts to Hūlegū-Khan. When the latter saw him, he received him with honor and placed him in front with the noyins, stipulating his place for standing, sitting, inquiring, and giving counsel" (KC pp. 230-32; Mur. pp. 104-105).

1

SO p. 161.

2

SO p. 168: "zi aynk'an lsoł ēr Hulawun nma. zi um kamer mah tayr acel, ew um kamer keans snorher, vasn oroy amenayn ok dołayr i nmane ew amenec un ačk i na hayein".

Sadun, according to Aknerc'i, was to be allowed pardons for up to nine crimes, so much was he cherished by Hülegü<sup>1</sup>. Tarsayič Orbēlean, following in his brother Smbat's steps was designated for extra special honors:

...So respected was he before Abaqa-Khān that on numerous occasions the latter removed from his person his own royal garments and clothed Tarsayič in them from head to toe, and girdled him with a belt of pure gold studded with costly gems and pearls... 2.

The loyalty and support of the mecatuns, or wealthy merchants who formed an important part of the new nobility of the 13th century were actively sought after by the Mongols from the first. In 1242, when the city of Karin/Erzerum was taken and its population massacred or enslaved, special consideration was shown to wealthy Armenians there<sup>3</sup>. According to Vardan Arew-

---

1 GA p. 348. Both Smbat and Sadun, and others besides made a point of learning Mongolian. According to SO, Smbat was "a skilled rhetorician, unbeatable at diwan court--for he spoke five languages: Armenian, Georgian, Uighur, Persian, and even Mongolian" (SO p. 151). See also KC p. 248; Mur. p. 120 where Sadun does simultaneous translation of Georgian and Mongolian at court. Grigor Mamikonean also knew Mongolian (KG p. 272).

2 SO p. 170: "ew avnk'an vargeal liner afaji Apalay lanin or bazum angam zark avakan handerin iwr merkac eal yanine hagic'aner Tarsayičin yotic minčew c Gluxu, ew zkamarn i hamak oskwoy bazmagin akambk' ew margartok ic eal tayr acei end mej nora...".

3 VA p. 147: "Now in the year 1242 Baiju noyin replaced the authority of Chormaghun and took the city of Karin, taking thence Umek, a man venerable, wealthy (mecatun)

elc'i, Hülegü utilized Armenian merchants as emissaries<sup>1</sup>.

Finally, co-optation of allegiance was furthered by intermarriage with the naxarars. The Christian Caucasian literary sources alone mention eight examples of intermarriage between the Mongols (or officials in the İl-Khānid administration) and the Christian Caucasian nobility: "Awag himself was given a Mongol bride named Eslom<sup>2</sup>; Hasan Jalal's daughter Ruzuk'an was wed to Chormaghun's son Bora noyin<sup>3</sup>; Xoşak Awagean was married to the sahibdiwan

---

and fearful of the Lord, as well as his relations, the sons of paron Yohann, Step'annos, and his five brothers". KG p. 363: "But one wealthy merchant was respected by them. He was Umek, whom they called Asil, a benevolent man whom we recalled [above], who lived through the Mongols' destruction of the city of Karin, together with his sons Yovhannes, Step'annos and his brothers. At this time [late 1240's, early 1250's] he was dwelling in the city of Tiflis, and was called the 'father' of the Georgian king David. He was honored by the Khan in writing and by all the [Mongol] nobility. He gave generous gifts to Arghun and those with him, and was much esteemed by him... The sons of Sarawan named Snorhawor and Mkrtiç were also prosperous and wealthy".

1

VA pp. 154-55: "In the year 1265 great Hülegü the İl-Khān summoned us by means of a man of the day, Snorhawor, more prominent than any, especially from among the laity. [He had come] from the governor of the north, Batu, where he went first and was honored, then [he was honored] by Hülegü İl-Khān. [Snorhawor] took us along with his merchandise and pack animals". On Mongol relations with the Armenian Church, see Appendix C.

2

KG p. 263; KC p. 225; Mur. p. 100.

3

KG p. 391.

Shams ad-Dīn Juvaini<sup>1</sup>; king David Lašaeen married Ixwand Esugan, a relative of Chormaghun<sup>2</sup>; king Demetre's sister Tamar was married to emir Arghun's son<sup>3</sup>; Demitre's daughter Rusudan, to the son of Buqa<sup>4</sup>; king Vaxt'ang married Arghun-Khān's sister, Oljat<sup>5</sup>, who subsequently was wed to Vaxt'ang's successor king David<sup>6</sup>. Cilician sources mention a number of Cilician Armenian notables also who had Mongol spouses, and most likely the Armeno--Saljuq nobility similarly intermarried with Mongol noyins<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> SO p. 165.

<sup>2</sup> SO p. 167; KC p. 251; Mur. p. 123.

<sup>3</sup> KC p. 274; Mur. p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> KC p. 281; Mur. p. 150. Also KC p. 285; Mur. p. 153.

<sup>5</sup> KC p. 293; Mur. p. 160.

<sup>6</sup> KC p. 297; Mur. p. 164.

<sup>7</sup> Toward the end of the 13th century, despite protestations from the Church, the Armeno-Georgian lords began imitating the Mongol and Islamic practise of polygamy. Consequently a number of potentially powerful alliances were formed. Tarsayiḥ Orbelean, for example, during the lifetime of his first wife, married Mina khatun Xalbakean of Xaḥen (d. 1311) sister of Hasan Jalal (X. 10, 117, 175, 177, 267). One of Tarsayiḥ's daughters was married into another branch of the Xalbakeans, while a second daughter became the wife of king Demitre's brother Manuel (SO p. 171). Sadun Arcruni took four wives, one of whom was king Demitre's only sister, Tamar (KC p. 278; Mur. p. 147). King Demitre himself had three wives, one of whom was the daughter of the powerful Beka Jaqeli of Samc'xe (KC pp. 282-83; Mur. 150-51). In the final decades of the 13th century, Orbeleans once again married into the Xalbakean family, and into the family of their rivals, the Arcruni/Mahkanaberdelis (SO p. 179).



During the Mongol domination de-naxararization occurred in Armenia as a result of different Mongol policies. During the 13th century, in some cases it was temporary and perhaps unintentional, such as the de-naxararization resulting from the Mongols' insistence that important lords visit the center of Mongol power (be it in Qara-Qorum in the Far East, or later in the Īl-Khānid centers of Iran and Armenia). Sometimes de-naxararization occurred through deaths of naxarars in foreign wars which, as Mongol clients, the naxarars were obliged to participate in. In other cases, de-naxararization was the result of intentional policy: punishment for rebellion and punishment for association with certain Mongol noyins who had fallen into disfavor. With the Islamization of the Mongol court in the 14th century and the concomitant inception of anti-Christian persecution, de-naxararization, by definition directed against one segment of society, degenerated into massacres (premeditated and "spontaneous") directed against all levels of Christian Armenian society.

Armenian and Georgian sources contain numerous references to the long and difficult journeys to the Far East undertaken by Caucasian lords. Apparently, the first naxarar to be sent to Qara-Qorum was Awag<sup>1</sup>. Atabek Iwanē's renowned

1

KG pp. 262-63: "After a short time had passed, they sent Awag on a distant journey to the northeast to their king, called Khan. For they did the same to all the grantees whom they wished to honor. They sent him to the king and, receiving [their] ruler's command, implemented it, for

daughter (Awag's sister) T'amt'a was taken to Mongolia after the capture of Xlat' (1245). After being kept there for "many years" she was allowed to return and reign over Xlat'<sup>1</sup>. Prior to the journey East of David Rusudanean, his royal mother sent Šahnšah, Awag, Vahram of Gag and Šota, the duke of Heret'i to the northern Batu-Khān<sup>2</sup>. At almost the same time the Mongols retrieved from captivity David Lašaeen (the legitimate heir to the throne). He too was sent to the Khāns, first to Batu, then to Möngke in Qara-Qorum. Accompanying David Lašaeen were Šahnšah's sons Zak'arē, Vahram's son

---

they were extremely obedient to their king. The prince himself was happy to go, so that perhaps his situation and that of the country be eased somewhat...

"Now Awag went before the great Khān and showed him letters from his commanders and recalled the reasons for his coming, that he had come to him in service. Once the great Khān heard that, he received Awag with affection, gave him a Tat'ar bride, and sent him to his country. He also wrote to his commanders to give Awag his lands, and with his help to subdue all the rebels, as happened".

<sup>1</sup> Her release was arranged by queen Rusudan's envoy, Hamadola, when the latter himself was on a trip to the Far East (KG p. 292).

<sup>2</sup> KG p. 192; Mur. p. 76.

Albula Gageli, and Sargis T'mogveli. Batu kept with him Zak'arē and Albula. David was sent East with Sargis "and a few other Georgians"<sup>1</sup>. When David and his party arrived in Qara-Qorum, "they encountered king Narin David [David Rusudanean], atabek Awag, Surameli, Gamrekeli, and the amirejib Bešk'en"<sup>2</sup>. Awag had been in Mongolia (or at least, out of Georgia) for some five years, according to the History of Kārt'li<sup>3</sup>. In the early 1250's Hasan Jalal also made the trip, first to Batu, then home to Xaçen, then, "after some days, being harassed by tax-collectors and by [the emir] Arghun, he went to Mōngke--Khān<sup>4</sup>. In the mid-1250's king Het'um of Cilician Armenia, with an entourage of princes and priests, made the journey to Mōngke, returning home after three and a half years<sup>5</sup>. Het'um's successors on the throne visited the İl-Khānid

---

<sup>1</sup> KC p. 219; Mur. p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> KC p. 220; Mur. p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> KC p. 220; Mur. p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> KG p. 359. See our Appendix C.

<sup>5</sup> KG pp. 364-65. On Het'um's journey see J.A. Boyle's article, "The Journey of He'tum I, King of Little Armenia, to the Court of the Great Khān Mōngke", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964) pp. 175-89, also Het'um the Historian, p. 47.

court in Tabrīz<sup>1</sup>. Smbat Orbēlean visited the Far East twice in that same decade, the first time (1252) remaining for three years<sup>2</sup>. In 1274, Smbat died at the Īl-Khānid court in Tabrīz<sup>3</sup>. For our purposes, it is irrelevant whether the nobles were sent to the Khāns as deputies or whether they travelled voluntarily. The effect was the same: the removal from Armenia of the most powerful (and potentially the most dangerous) lords. In the absence of certain grandees, other lords could and did attempt to encroach upon their rivals' lands and rights. Though this form of de-naxararization may have been temporary, the centrifugal results promoted by it were not.

More costly in terms of human life was the de-naxararization resulting from the obligation of the lords to participate with their cavalry in Mongol campaigns<sup>4</sup>. Because the Mongols considered their subject peoples

---

<sup>1</sup> Lewon (Het'um p. 57); Het'um II (Het'um p. 221); Lewon paron Het'um and other princes travelled to Bularghu who treacherously murdered them in 1309 (14CC p. 56).

<sup>2</sup> SO p. 155. It was probably during those three years that Smbat learned some of his five languages (SO p.151). Mamikonids visited the Khan in the 1260's (VT p. 108).

<sup>3</sup> SO p. 166.

<sup>4</sup> KG p. 269; GA p. 297.

expendable, they usually designated them as advance--attackers. This was not, as the History of K'art'li and Grigor Aknerc'i would have us believe, because the Armeno-Georgian troops were such excellent warriors, but first, precisely because the Caucasians were expendable and second, because desertion was impossible with foreign troops fighting in front or in detachments surrounded by Mongols. Deserters were killed. This fact perhaps accounts for the "valor" so extensively recounted in the sources, and so reminiscent in spirit to those epic descriptions of naxarar single-combat exploits found in the Arsacid sources. The Caucasian troops had a simple choice facing them: life and the spoils of victory, or death from defeat or attempted desertion.

Also facing the lords (at least in western historical Armenia) were the Armenian and Georgian defenders of their own country, Rūm. Armenians and Georgians fought and died on both sides<sup>1</sup>. With the subjugation of western Armenia, the obligation of military service to the Mongol overlords did not end. The lords and their troops were taken on campaigns all over the Middle East, North Africa, and Asia.

---

<sup>1</sup> KC p. 192; Mur. p. 77; GA p. 309.

De-naxararization in this instance involved the removal of powerful military men from the Caucasus "temporarily" during campaigns of varying durations, and permanently, through death in foreign lands.

According to the History of K'art'li, the stringent requirements involved in participating in Mongol campaigns were a major cause of the Caucasian princes' rebellion of 1259-61:

...The Georgians were menaced because [the Mongols] were fighting a protracted and uninterrupted war [lasting 7 years] against the Assassins, while the Georgians were fighting along with them, divided into two sections. Each [Georgian] ruler was apportioned [to the service of] one noyin... 1.

...[The Georgian lords] all wondered: 'What shall we do without someone of the royal line to guide us and fight against the Tatars? We are disunited and unable to resist them. So wickedly do they menace us that we go off to Alamut each year, withstanding all sorts of troubles and dangers. 2.

It is true that the Mongols placed considerable trust in certain Armenian lords, such as amirspasalar Šahnšah's son Zak'arē and Ptoš Xalbakēan who aided in the capture of Baghdad (1258)<sup>3</sup>. The honors bestowed upon the noted

---

<sup>1</sup> KC p. 208; Mur. p. 88

<sup>2</sup> KC p. 214; Mur. p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> KG pp. 380, 384, 385.

military man Tarsayiĉ Orbēlean by Abaqa-Khān are also noteworthy<sup>1</sup>.

Often the Caucasians suffered decimation . In 1261 many Armenian and Georgian warriors died when Mongol general Kitbuqa's army in Egypt was wiped out<sup>2</sup>. Prince Sewada Iaĉenc'i was killed in the battle for Mayyāfārikīn<sup>3</sup>. In 1261/62 (710 A.E.) the young prince Burt'el Orbēlean died in the North Caucasus, fighting Hūlegū's enemy, Berke<sup>4</sup>. Caucasians died in the war

---

<sup>1</sup> SO p. 170: "...And because [Tarsayiĉ] was a man powerful and intrepid, warlike, and of astounding size, wherever he went he displayed great valor in all warfare: in Khurasan, Syria, Rum, in Hams and Ham, among the Egyptians and in Darband. Nine times personally did he direct the battle, as a consequence of which he was honored with many great gifts by the King of Kings and received a golden balis which was flat, the size of a fig, and in weight one liter--for such was the honor of victory".

<sup>2</sup> KG pp. 388-89.

<sup>3</sup> VA p. 152.

<sup>4</sup> SO p. 162; CIA v. III p. 218 (foldout).

between Arghun-Khān and Baraq in the mid-1260's in Central Asia<sup>1</sup>. In the late 1270's, Caucasian troops suffered dreadful losses during the Mongols' ill-conceived expeditions in Gīlān, on the southern shore of the Caspian Sea<sup>2</sup>, while in 1282 Caucasian contingents fighting again in Egypt were all but wiped out<sup>3</sup>. In 1283, in Khurāsān, the Georgian king Demitre and his army participated on the wrong side in a succession struggle between Ahmad and the eventual victor, Arghun--Khān<sup>4</sup>. Shortly thereafter the king and his troops were taken north to suppress a rebellion in Darband<sup>5</sup>. Geikhātu-Khān crushed a rebellion in Rūm with the army of Demitre's son, David while another part of the Caucasian

---

<sup>1</sup> KC pp. 262-64; Mur. pp. 133-35.

<sup>2</sup> KC p. 276; Mur. p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> According to BH p. 457, in 1277 some 2,000 Georgians (i.e., Caucasians) were killed in Egypt; KC pp. 278-80 Mur. pp. 146-49; Het'um pp. 58-59; BH p. 464 mentions 5,000 Caucasian troops fighting in Egypt.

<sup>4</sup> KC p. 284; Mur. p. 152.

<sup>5</sup> KC p. 285; Mur. p. 153.



troops remained on alert in Mūghān<sup>1</sup>. Around 1305, immediately preceding Khar-Banda's conversion to Islam, king Giorgi and various princes were fighting in Iconium<sup>2</sup>. De-naxararization through participation in Mongol expeditions resulted in more than the deaths of thousands of men. In the absence of the naxarar warlords, the Caucasus was left without committed defenders to protect it from the persistent raids and sorties of Mongols, Turks and local rebels.

De-naxararization also was achieved directly by execution, the ordinary punishment for disloyalty, real or perceived. The lordly participants in the abortive Caucasian uprising of 1248/49, though arrested and condemned to death, nonetheless were released, thanks mostly to the humanity of Awag's Mongol friend, general Chaghatai. However the rebels' properties were ravaged in reprisal<sup>3</sup>. Response to the second rebellion of 1259-61 was less restrained. Unable to vent their anger on the participants immediately, the Mongols

---

<sup>1</sup> KC p. 296; Mur. p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> KC p. 324; Mur. p. 188.

<sup>3</sup> KG pp. 320-21; VA p. 148.

destroyed the mausolea of the Georgian kings at Gelat<sup>1</sup>, and the kat'olikosate at Aclor<sup>1</sup>, and then arrested the naxarar relatives of the rebels:

[Emir] Arghun seized the Georgian queen Gonc'a, her daughter Xoşak', the great prince Sahnşah, Hasan Jalal, lord of Xaçen, and many others because of debts and taxes [owed]. These people gave much treasure and barely saved their lives.<sup>2</sup>

Hasan Jalal, however, was tortured to death in 1261<sup>3</sup>. The

<sup>1</sup> KG p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> ibid: "...ew i kalans arar zt'aguhin vrac' zGonc'ayn, ew zdustr iwr, zXoşak'n, ew zisxann mec zSahnşah, ew zJalaln Hasan zter Xaçenoy, ew zavls bazums patcafanok' partuc ew harki, voroc bazum ganls afeal, haziw zercan i mahuane".

<sup>3</sup> KG pp. 390-91: "But the pious and virtuous prince Jalal was molested by impossible tortures, as they demanded more taxes from him than he could pay. They put wood on his neck and irons on his feet. They dealt with him in this manner because of his strong Christianity, for all the Muslims were inimical to him and urged Arghun to kill him, saying: 'He more [than others] is hostile to our religion and laws'. For Arghun also was Muslim. He took [Jalal] to Qazvin. Meanwhile Jalal bore everything with praise, for he was very well versed in Scripture, fasting and praying, modest in food and drink and desirous of a martyr's death.

"Now Jalal's daughter Ruzuk'an, wife of Bora noyin (son of Chormaghun, first general of the Tatars) went to Hülegü's wife [the Nestorian Christian] Toguz khatun to free her father from Arghun's clutches. When the impious ostikan [Arghun] learned this, he immediately sent executioners and had the blessed and just man killed during the night. The impious executioners went and tore Jalal's body into pieces...in 1261/62 (710 A.E.)".

next year, Zak'arē was murdered<sup>1</sup>.

As was pointed out in another connection, the closeness of certain Caucasian lords to suddenly-disgraced Mongol noyins was fatal. Thus in 1289, when Arghun-Khān crushed a plot against himself organized by the emir Buqa, he also executed king Demitre of Georgia who had married Buqa's daughter and was, rightly or wrongly, implicated. Similarly, when Geikhatu succeeded his brother Arghun as Khān in 1291, he in turn killed off Arghun's prominent supporters, among whom were many Armenians<sup>2</sup>.

---

1

KG p. 393: "Now it happened that Zak'arē was with Arghun and his many troops in Georgia. And Zak'are went unbeknownst to Arghun and the other soldiers to see his wife who was with her father Sargis, prince of Urtik', one of the rebels with the Georgian king David. When Arghun learned about this, he notified Hülegü who himself ordered that Zak'are be taken shackled. He heaped other false accusations upon him, ordered him killed, dismembered, and thrown to the dogs. And when his father Sahn'sah in the village of Ojun heard the bad news, he became aggrieved and died of sorrow".

2

See below chapter two p. 122 notes 1 and 2.

## Triumph of the Turkmen

The barely controllable, plunder-hungry Turkmen element which formed the mainstay of the armies of the Saljuq conquerors of the 11th century also participated in all subsequent Turco-Mongol invasions. It had no interest in good government or the maintenance of order. On the contrary, the nomadic Turkmen solely were concerned with the aggrandizement of portable wealth. The lives of despoiled populations were of no value to them, unless such populations could be sold into slavery. Yet, as was pointed out earlier, all Saljuqs and all Mongols did not share these aims. Consequently, centralizing forces within both the Saljuq and Mongol governments were obliged to support a very delicate balance. On the one hand, the warlike Turkmen were the best, most determined fighters and so were necessary for victorious expeditions. On the other hand, the Turkmen's impulse to destroy all and move on had to be fought--sometimes literally-- in order for the more sedentary elements to impose taxation on the conquered peoples, and exploit them in a more systematic fashion. But eventually the Turkmen were victorious, destroying both organized Turkish and Mongol states. Destructive nomadism of the Turkmen type (essentially a type of economic parasitism) also was practised by some Kurdish and Arab groups operating in southern and southwestern Armenia.

The initial Mongol expedition of 1220/21 was in the Caucasus primarily for reconnaissance. Apart from reporting the pilfering of herds and the sack of some few cities, the Caucasian sources do not dwell on unbridled Turkmen activity at that time. This reconnaissance army was disciplined and obedient to its commanders.

The nature of Turkmen activity becomes clearer with the destructive sojourn of Jalāl al-Dīn on the Armenian highlands (1225-ca. 1230). During these five bloody years, Jalāl held the loyalty of the Turkmen in his company by giving them full rein, and directing them especially against Christians. While the actual devotion to Islam of Jalāl or of his rude hordes is questionable, his technique of directing rampages against Christians effectively satisfied the army's lust for plunder and simultaneously provided a religious justification for its actions. Jalāl's career was that of a Turkmen brigand and he died the death of an unsuccessful brigand chief. He was abandoned by the army when he was unable to provide it with more loot. With his murder, as we have seen, Turkmen in small bands continued harassing sedentary populations and caravans all over the Middle East .

When the Mongols returned in 1236, the Turkmen element in their midst was satiated somewhat by the sack of resisting cities. However, even in this early period of Mongol rule,

when the central government was at its strongest, there is evidence of irregularities. For example, the Armenian city of Surb Mari (Surmalu) was sacked by the regular Mongol army, but then ravished a second time by a certain noble named Lara Bahatur<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, during the taking of Western Armenia, though it was Mongol policy to spare surrendering cities, some were sacked nonetheless, because chieftains could not control their men, or (perhaps better) because so many chieftains themselves were inclined to plunder. The centrifugal nomadic element was unaccustomed to and uninterested in sedentary government and its forms. The Turco-Mongol nomads were unhappy at the fixed rates of taxation imposed on subject populations. Indeed, their constant illegal exactions were the root cause behind each Caucasian rebellion<sup>2</sup>. Nor, clearly, did this element fancy the exalted stations given to some of the Caucasian nobles. For example, the death of Awag's influential patron, the Mongol general Chormaghun in 1242/43 led to an increase in disorders of all sorts. Turkmens immediately plotted (unsuccessfully) to murder Awag<sup>3</sup>. When the same

<sup>1</sup> KG p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> KG pp. 263-64; GA pp. 321, 323.

<sup>3</sup> KG p. 264.

elements in the army learned about plans for a Caucasian rebellion (1249/50):

...suddenly all the nobility of the Tatar army held a council, armed, and universally wanted to ravage the lands of Armenia and Georgia, [lands] obedient to them, because the Georgian king sought to rebel with all the princes...[the Mongols] wanted generally to destroy everyone. 1.

Awag's patron and friend Chaghatai prevented this, and in a dramatic appeal to the furious Mongols presented the views of the central government, barely preventing a massacre of the captured naxarars:

...One of the senior leaders, general of the entire army named Chaghatai, a friend of Awag, came amidst the armed troops and said to them: 'We have no order from the Khan to kill those who are obedient to us, stand in service to us, and pay taxes to the Khan. And the reality of their rebellion is not certain. But if we destroy them without cause, you will be responsible to the Khan. 2.

Though the naxarars were not executed, the Turkmens, nonetheless, were allowed to vent their rage on the Caucasian

---

1

KG p. 319: "...yankarcaki xorhurd arareal amenayn awaganin t'at ar zorun, varec an zinu ew kazmec an af hasarak kotorel zasxarhs Hayoc ew Vrac zhnazandeals iwreanc, vasn ayspisi patcari, te apastambel kami t'agaworn vrac amenayn isxanok n...kamein af hasarak kotorel zamenesin".

2

KG p. 320: "...Mi omn yawag glxaworac'n, or soravar er amenayn zorun, Calatay anun nora, or barekann er Awagin,

population<sup>1</sup>.

Centrifugal elements within the Mongol army of occupation were not the only ones facing Armenians and Georgians. According to Bar Hebraeus and the History of K'art'li, in the 1230's and 1240's, remnants of Jalāl al-Dīn's nomadic Khwarazmian army entered Georgia and harassed the settled population<sup>2</sup>. Khwarazmian mercenaries also operated in the Mayyāfārikin area in southwestern Armenia during the 1240's<sup>3</sup>. In 1255, Mongol rebels despoiled

---

ekac' i mēl vafeal zōrac'n ew agē c'nosa. 'Mek' oç' unimk' hraman i lanen kotōrel zaynosik, or hnazandēal en mez ew kan mez i catayut ean ew harkatuk en lanin. ew irk' apstambut ean noc a çs çsmarteal. Ard' et e kotokek' znosa atanc patçafi, duk tayk patasxani lanin".

1

KG pp. 320-21: "[The Mongols] attacked Georgia, falling upon many districts of the rebels and non-rebels. They cut down many people and took even more captive; a countless multitude of men, women and children they drowned in the river. And this took place in 1249/50 (698 A.E.)". VA p. 148: "...Countless numbers were killed and enslaved, villages and fields [were destroyed], and they disgraced women in Armenia, but more so in Georgia" .

2

BH p. 402; KC pp. 212-15; Mur. pp. 91-92.

3

BH p. 403.



villages around Melitene/Malatya<sup>1</sup>, and still were active in the same area at the close of the decade<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, the arrival in Hülegü's realm of some seven of Chingiz-Khān's unruly grandchildren from the North, and their partial settlement in the Caucasus (mid-1250's) introduced another centrifugal force given over to pillaging. In the late 1250's the Caucasus was ravaged by one of these arrivals, Iul<sup>3</sup>. In 1268 another of the émigrés, Tegüder, rebelled from the Īl-Khāns, causing chaos and destruction in Armenia and Georgia<sup>4</sup>.

Because of anti-Islamic feeling among the Mongols at the time of the invasion, the shamanist Turkmens' rage often was channeled against Muslims--much to the delight of beleaguered Christians. However, Mongol religious policy was quite complex, and underwent numerous shifts. For example, at the time of the census conducted by Arghun and Buqa (1243), Kirakos said that Buqa "...had assembled brigands from among the Persians and Tačiks, who mercilessly performed deeds of cruelty

---

1 BH p. 420.

2 BH pp. 425-26.

3 GA pp. 327, 329.

4 KC pp. 258-67; Mur. pp. 129-37.

and were especially inimical toward the Christians"<sup>1</sup>. Yet in 1258, during the siege of Baghdad, the Mongols encouraged the Christians in their army brutally to exterminate the city's Muslim population. But in retaliation for the Caucasian rebellion of 1259-61, Mongols destroyed churches and the Georgian kat'olikosate itself, and the emir Arghun (himself a Muslim) had the Christian prince Hasan Jalal tortured to death for failure to apostasize<sup>2</sup>. Clearly, Mongols adroitly used the Christians in Muslim areas and the Muslims in Christian Caucasia for espionage and maintenance of terror.

With the increasing Islamization of the Mongols, their policy changed. Once again, as had happened during the invasions of the Saljuqs and the Khwarazmians, fanatical Islam was wed to the nomads' lust for booty. From toward the end of the 13th century to beyond the end of the 14th century, anti-Christian persecutions prevailed almost uninterruptedly. What earlier had been punishment meted out to an occasionally recalcitrant naxarar became the generalized fate of all Christians refusing to convert. Nomads of all kinds of backgrounds, circulating in different

---

<sup>1</sup> KG p. 313: "...zi žoloveal ēr iwr ara srikays i parsic' ew i tačkak' ork anxnay gorceinzgore xakut san ew t snamik' ein afawel k ristoneic".

<sup>2</sup> KG pp. 390-91.

parts of the Armenian highlands, attacked churches, monasteries, wealthy and poor Christians. Already in the late 1270's Turkmens killed Sargis, the influential bishop of Erzinjan<sup>1</sup>. In 1290, the anti-Christian lord of Mayyāfārikin had the Armenian lord of Muš assassinated and then persecuted the monks of Tarōn<sup>2</sup>. In 1290/91 a peripatetic Armenian priest, Grigor, was killed at Xarberd, and 45 Armenian mecatuns in the city were arrested. It is interesting that this episode is recounted both in Bar Hebraeus<sup>3</sup> and in an Armenian martyrology. In the Armenian account, the Mongol governor barely restrained a Muslim mob from killing the 45 merchants. This scene is reminiscent of Kirakos' account of Chaghatai's rescue of the arrested naxarars (1249/50). It is one of the last examples of such restraint to be found in the sources:

...But a certain chief named T'at'laray, of the Nation of the Archers, got up, mounted a horse, .. [came] with his troops, snatched the bound [prisoners] away from them and set them free in peace. Then he threatened [the would-be killers] saying: 'Were you to slay such citizens, what answer should I give to the world-conquering Khan by whom I was sent to guard this city? 4.

---

<sup>1</sup> SA p. 162. Samuēl's continuator places the murder in 1272, though the Annals of Bishop Step'annos (MC vol. 1 p. 44) puts it in 1276. See above ch. two pp. 120-21 n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> BH p. 484.

<sup>3</sup> BH pp. 483-84.

<sup>4</sup> ANM p. 115.

In the coming decades, no "answer" would have been necessary, as anti-Christian persecution became policy. Such persecutions, executions, confiscations, and destructions of churches were reported from all parts of historical Armenia<sup>1</sup>. Anti-Christian persecution was launched formally with the plundering and killing exped-

1

For the first decade of the 14th century, surviving colophons speak of persecutions and confiscations at Alt'amar (14CC p. 41), and of Turkmen attacks on Tayk'/Tao (KC pp. 310-12; Mur. pp. 175-77). During the second decade there were destructions of monasteries in parts of northeastern Armenia (14CC p. 66), and at Karin (14CC p. 102, also the martyrdom of bishop Grigor Karneci d. 1321/22 ANM pp. 121-27), persecutions in southern Armenia at Alt'amar (14CC p. 114), Varaga (14CC pp. 136-37), Berkri (14CC p. 144), Sebastia (14CC p. 163). The third decade brought a slight relaxation of the terror, but soon it escalated again (VT p. 164). In the fourth decade, persecution was reported from Iranian Tabriz (14CC p. 283), Lofi in northern Armenia (14CC p. 249), Alt'amar (14CC p. 259), Goit'n (14CC p. 281), and Erznjan. This last city was attacked by a coalition of Mongols, Turkmens and Kurds (14CC p. 305). In the fifth decade persecutions, brigandage, and massacres continued at Erznjan (14CC p. 325), Tayk' (14CC p. 327), Bayburt and Tevrike (14CC p. 369), C'ina (14CC p. 379) and between 1350 and 1360 occurred at Alt'amar (14CC pp. 405, 414), Erznjan (14CC p. 411), and Bjni (VT pp. 169-70). In the seventh decade there were persecutions, expulsions, massacres and destructions of churches in Hayoc' Jor near Julamerik (14CC p. 458) and Muš (14CC p. 483). Reference to persecutions in the above cities should not be taken to mean that persecutions occurred solely there and solely at that date. Anti-Christian terror was a permanent feature of the 14th century and it was general throughout the Armenian highlands, north, south, east, and west, though its scale and intensity did vary greatly.

itions of Nauruz (1295/96) during the reign of Ghazan-Khān. Whether or not Ghazan at first knew about Nauruz' activities is disputed from source to source. Granted, Nauruz eventually was hunted down and executed at Ghazan's command, with Christian Caucasians gleefully participating. But by then, the Turkmens were no longer controllable.

Not surprisingly, the "hellish and bitter" 14th century did not produce literary historians such as Kirakos, Vardan, or Step'annos. The disorganized history of T'ovma Mecop'ec'i (d. ca. 1446) does speak of the last three decades of the 14th century, but for the first seven decades, only the humble authors of chronicles and colophons, many of them anonymous, detail the persecutions, plunderings of churches and famines. They do not speak of land disputes among naxarars--many of whom already had quit the country, had apostasized, or been killed.

In the 1320's, Grigor, bishop of Karin/Erzerum was killed after refusing to convert<sup>1</sup>. In 1334 Christians were obliged to wear special blue badges as a visible indicator of their subordinate status<sup>2</sup>, just as economically

---

<sup>1</sup> SA p. 167 dates this in 1321/22, while ANM p. 123 has 1326/27.

<sup>2</sup> SA p. 165.

their subordinate status was made formal years before (1301/2) by the inception of the kharaġ tax, an annual tax on Christians<sup>1</sup>. The requirement of the blue badge, kerchief, or hat, to set the Christians apart from Muslims was observed by the Bavarian captive, Johann Schiltberger around 1400, and so was a feature of the entire 14th century<sup>2</sup>.

With the breakdown of the Īl-Khānīd government in the 1330's, various Turkmen, Mongol, and Kurdish bands became completely unchecked. For example, in 1343, the Qara Qoyunlu (Black Sheep) Turkmens (who had established bases in Bagrewand and Kaĵberunik' in the late 13th century) were ceaselessly raiding around Xlat'<sup>3</sup>. The Spanish Muslim traveller Ibn Battuta in 1333 noted that Karin/Erzerum was "mostly in ruins as a consequence of a factional feud which broke out between two groups of Turkmens there"<sup>4</sup>. During the 1330's and 1340's, the cities of Erzñjan, Sebastia/Sīvās, and Karin/Erzerum were under almost constant seige by rival nomadic groups<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> SA p. 165.

<sup>2</sup> JS p. 74.

<sup>3</sup> 14CC p. 334.

<sup>4</sup> Battūta p. 437.

<sup>5</sup> SA pp. 167-69.

Xlat' was captured by Turkmens in 1359<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, in the 1380's, Tīmūr's detachments frequently battled with Qara Qoyunlu and Kurdish groups. In the Čapaĭjur and Muš areas and near Karin/Erzerum, the Turkmens successfully resisted Tīmūr's advance<sup>2</sup>. In 1382 Turkmen groups were fighting in the plain of Artaz<sup>3</sup>. During his second invasion (1395) Tīmūr raided Turkmen areas centered at Arčēš on Lake Van's northern shore<sup>4</sup>.

Concomitant with the chaos occasioned by warring nomads went persecution of Christians--especially of the clerical nobility. In 1387/88, Step'annos, archbishop of Sebastia/Sīvās was executed for failure to convert. His monastery of St. Nšan was converted into a dervish sanctuary, and other churches there were demolished<sup>5</sup>. In 1393/94, kat'olikos Zak'aria of Alt'amar and the kat'olikos of Sis, T'ēodoros both were executed<sup>6</sup>. Between

---

<sup>1</sup> SA p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> TM p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> SA p. 170.

<sup>4</sup> TM pp. 46-47.

<sup>5</sup> ANM pp. 144-45.

<sup>6</sup> SA p. 172.

1403 and 1406, according to the Spanish ambassador Clavijo, Tīmūr demolished the churches of Erznjan and Bekafid<sup>1</sup>.

The triumph of the Turkmens drained Armenia<sup>4</sup> in numerous ways. H. Manandyan and L. Babayan have observed the collapse of Armenia's economy, pointing out the incompatibility of the nomadic economic system with the agricultural and mercantile economy of Armenia.<sup>2</sup> The Mongols expropriated for their own use vast tracts of land in Armenia, taking certain choice farming areas for summer and winter pasturage for their herds. The slopes of the Aragac mountains, and the areas of Vayoc' Jor, parts of the plain of Ayrarat, and areas around Karin/Erzerum, Van, Berkri, and Balesh/Bitlis became summer vaylas, while Vaspurakan, the Ayrarat plains and the Xarberd region were used for wintering places<sup>3</sup>. These areas formerly had been under intensive agricultural development, but increasingly in the late 13th and in the 14th century they became semi-desert<sup>4</sup>. Parts of southern

---

<sup>1</sup> Clav. pp. 130, 138.

<sup>2</sup> H.A. Manandyan, Trade, chp. VI pp. 201-202, chp. VI passim; L.H. Babayan, Aknarkner mi nadarvan havastani patmut' iwnic [Episodes from the History of Medieval Armenia], Kotvorakan feodalakan intesakevi tirapetut' van hetevank nere nstakyac' zolovurdneri intesakan kvank' i vra [Consequences of the Dominance of the Nomadic Feudal Economic System on the Economic Life of Sedentary Peoples] [Episodes] pp. 77-119.

<sup>3</sup> Episodes p.83.

<sup>4</sup> HAP p. 657.



and western Armenia were used almost solely for animal husbandry. The Mongols and Turkmen nomads used the area between Erznjan, Bayberd, and Sebastia/Sīvās, and areas around Van and in Diyārbakr for these purposes, also<sup>1</sup>. Not only was good farmland allowed to desiccate, but with the mass enslavings and deportations of whole villages, there were even fewer farmers; and with the mass theft of livestock, remaining farmers often were deprived of their only source of power for pulling the plow.

A part of the Caucasian land-owning class also was deprived of land and driven to bankruptcy by the Mongols' excessive tax demands. Already by the time of the princes' rebellion of 1259-61, the sources speak of the impoverishment of some of the princes:

...With [the rebel king David] went many other great princes of districts who were harassed and harried, bankrupt, and who had mortgaged cities and districts, but were still unable to satiate the evil, leech-like appetite [of the Mongols]. 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 658.

<sup>2</sup> KG p. 389: "...end nma ew ayl mecamec iṣxank' gawafac' nelealk ew tarapealk', caxealk ew graw edealk' zk'alak' ew zḡawars, ew oḡ karac' ealk' yagec uc anel zanyags est nmanut ean çar tṣrkac'w."

At the same time that certain large landholders were selling their estates, a few Mongol favorites such as Sahmadin, Umek, Snorhawor and Sadun Arcruni were purchasing them and became landholders after the example of the Mongol aristocrats, owning huge properties in different states<sup>1</sup>. However, the wealth of these few lords, accumulated from trading and land speculation, cannot serve as an index of the country's prosperity.

The decline of Armenia's cities in this period was caused by Turkmen ravages, excessive taxation, and by the transferal of the international trade routes. Rashīd al-Dīn speaking about the disastrous situation at the beginning of the 14th century, wrote that five of every ten houses were deserted, and that numerous cities on both sides of the Euphrates had been abandoned<sup>2</sup>. Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazvīnī noted the decline of cities and towns in Caucasia across the Armenian highlands in his day (1340). Speaking of Georgia and Abkhazia, he stated that "revenues in time of their native kings amounted to near 5,000,000 dinars of the present currency; but in our times the government only obtains 1,202,000 dinars"<sup>3</sup>. About Rūm, which embraced western Armenia, he said: "Its revenues at the present day amount to 3,300,000

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 657.

<sup>2</sup> Rashīd, III pp. 308-309; Yov. Yīš. p. 992.

<sup>3</sup> Q p. 94.

dinars as set down in the registers; but during the time of the Saljuqs they were in excess of 15,000,000 dinars of the present currency"<sup>1</sup>. The walls of Sebastia/Sīvās were in ruins<sup>2</sup>; Awnik was in ruins<sup>3</sup>; Bayburt "was a large town; it is now but a small one"<sup>4</sup>; Muš "in former times a large city, but now a ruin"<sup>5</sup>; Berkri "a small town, that was a large place formerly"<sup>6</sup>; "Van is a fortress and Vastan (Ostan) was a large town formerly, but now only of medium size"<sup>7</sup>. Xlat' "is the capital of this province [Greater Armenia] and its revenues in former days amounted to near 2,000,000 dinars of the present currency; but now the total sum paid is only 390,000 dinars"<sup>8</sup>. Until the Saljuq invasions, Siwnik' had some

---

<sup>1</sup> Q p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Q p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Q p. 105.

<sup>6</sup> Q p. 100.

<sup>7</sup> Q. p. 101.

<sup>8</sup> Q. p. 100.

1,000 villages, while at the end of the 13th century, the figure had declined by 331 to 677 villages. According to Samuēl of Ani and Matthew of Edessa, the former Arçrunid kingdom in Vaspurakan had over 4,000 villages, but 13th and 14th century authors speak of that area with distress, as if describing a desert<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, in the 1350's the trade routes shifted away from the northern cities of Ani and Kars, to southern cities of Klat', Mayyāfārikīn/Np'rkert, and Arčēs, helping to impoverish northeastern Armenia<sup>2</sup>. Not surprisingly, it is precisely from the mid-14th century that the great naxarar families of northeastern Armenia quickly fade from the sources, literary and inscriptional. Influential Zak'arids, Vaçuteans and Prošcans (known as such, and not by a different surname) are unknown after 1360, and noteworthy Orbēleans and Dop'cans are mentioned last at the end of the 14th century<sup>3</sup>.

An important aspect of the Turkmens' triumph concerns the settlement of Turco-Mongol populations across the Armenian highlands. Regrettably, the sources do not contain much information on this question. The sources mention Mongols established in the area between Erzincan

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 661.

<sup>2</sup> Manandyan, Trade, pp. 197-200.

<sup>3</sup> HAP pp. 642-44. R. Hewsen's articles ("The Meliks" in REA) have demonstrated the probable survival of "noble" status within melik families descended from the naxarars

Bayburt and Sebastia/Sīvās; Qara-Qoyunlu Turkmen in the Lake Van basin; Aq-Qoyunlu Turkmen in the Amida-Diyārbakr area<sup>1</sup>. Presumably some of those areas of southern and western Armenia which the nomads used for their yaylas eventually were transformed into sedentary communities. In the 1403-1406 period, Clavijo encountered but two yaylas, one near Bekafič and the other in Ernĵak, though clearly there must have been more<sup>2</sup>. Johan Schiltberger speaks of Turkmens in the Samsun area, renting pasturage<sup>3</sup>. With time, more and more Turkmens began settling in or near cities. Clavijo observed that both Erzincan and Ani--two traditionally Armenian cities--had Turkmen governors, and that Bekafič had an Armenian and a Turkish suburb<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Episodes p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> Clav. pp. 138, 148.

<sup>3</sup> JS p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Clav. pp. 138-39, 333.

Naxarar Reactions to Mongol Control Techniques of the  
13-14th Centuries

Naxarar reactions to the different control techniques used by the Mongols before and after their Islamization were varied, but contained no elements previously unknown in the long history of the naxarars. We have observed naxarar reaction to the invasions: when united military resistance proved impossible, the naxarars holed up in their mountain fortresses; when they learned that the Mongols spared those submitting peaceably, the naxarars submitted, making separate often highly advantageous arrangements with their new overlords. As for the domination, naxarar reactions to Mongol control techniques in the 13-14th centuries may be grouped under five major headings. The lords (1) attempted when possible to exploit the rivalry between different centers of Mongol authority; (2) rebelled, when feeling themselves sufficiently powerful or when driven to it by Mongol excesses; (3) emigrated from the Armenian highlands in large numbers; (4) Islamized in large numbers, and (5) withstood everything, retaining the Christian faith and also a certain leverage with the Turco-Mongol régimes. Some lords of totally impregnable fortresses became caravan-looters and bandits. Other lords sometimes were able to retain certain privileges and even family lands through the process of giving their

lands to religious establishments under the control of clerical representatives of the secular lord's own family.

The naxarars traditionally attempted to exploit big power rivalries whenever they believed that they stood to gain leverage thereby. This required the existence of two or more foreign rivals powerful enough potentially to balance each other and also willing to intervene militarily or diplomatically in the Caucasus. Did such a situation exist in the 13-14th centuries? At certain times it did, although it did not produce the results hoped for by the naxarars. The two Mongol rivals were the Īl-Khān state in Iran, centered at Tabrīz, and the state of the Norther Tatars (the Golden Hōrde) centered at Sarai on the Volga river. The rivalry between these two, which broke into open warfare in the mid-1260's, manifested itself at least twenty years earlier. Influence over the Caucasus, which each side regarded as its own, was but one factor in this dispute, but the crucial one from the standpoint of certain Caucasian lords seeking maneuverability.

At the time of the Mongol conquest (1236), queen Rusudan of Georgia fled for safety to the distant city of Kutais in northwestern Georgia. The Mongols sent emissaries (including Armenian naxarars) to her demanding her submission and that she send them her son David Rusudanean

...But she did not do so, and instead sent Iwane's son Awag who was among/in the Tatar army (=had already submitted) with a few soldiers to the Tatars, saying: 'Until the ambassador whom I sent to the Khan your king returns, I cannot come to you. 1.

It was at this point that the enraged Mongols enthroned Rusudan's nephew, the legitimate heir, David Lašaeen:

Now when David's aunt Rusudan heard about this, she fled to Abxazia and Svanetia with her son, the other David (i.e. David Rusudanean), and sent ambassadors to the other Tatar commander, Batu, a relative of the Khan... She offered him her submission. Batu ordered her to reside in Tiflis, and no one opposed this, since during this time the [Great] Khan had died. 2.

Rusudan's plans were thwarted when the Mongols decided to enthrone both Davids, indicating that two could play the same game. But with the deepening of hostilities between the Īl-Khāns and the Northern Tatars, the question of Georgian allegiance became crucial. Indeed, years later, when Hülegü was planning to kill hostage members of king David Lašaeen's family, he was prudently stopped by his wife:

---

1  
 KG p. 288: "Isk na zays oġ arareal` tay sakaw zōrre ew i jeŋn kwagin, ordwoyn iwanei, or er end T at ar zorun, yie at nosa aselov. Minčew e skeal despann im, zor yieac i at xalann, ark ayn ier, oġ karem gal at jez".

2  
 KG p. 289: "Isk hōrak`oyr nora Ruzudan` ibrew luaw zayn, p areaw yāp xazet ew i Suanet` ordwoyn iwrov miws Dawt aw ew yieac despans at miws zoraqlux t at arin, orum anun ar Bat`u, azgakan lanin..kal nma hnazand, ew na hramayeac".



Remember too that your brother, the great Khan Batu's son [Berke] has sent many emissaries and given great gifts [to David] so that they give[him] the Darial [pass] and the western highway, and that both are in his (David's) hands ...for should the army of Batu's ulus and that of the [Georgian] king unite, there shall be great disorder. 1.

In the very last years of the 13th century once again the Georgian king attempted alliance with the Northern Tatars, sending his son and brother to them. Despite his disloyalty, the Il-Khāns were sufficiently concerned to seek reconciliation with the king "so that the king would swear an oath of loyalty to Ghazan, and not permit passage to Batu's grandson, the great Khān Toqta"<sup>2</sup>. With the deterioration of the sources in the 14th century, references to alliances with the Northern Tatars disappear. However, the Northern connection remained a double-edged sword, as the events of the late 1380's were to prove.

Was the Georgian royal family alone among the lords to attempt using the Golden Horde for leverage? Apparently not. Hasan Jalal believed that he could achieve manauverability similarly. It was from Batu that Hasan received injū status (ca. 1257) although eventually he too was

---

nma nstel i Tp'xis, ew sok'a oġ anddimac'an, k'anzi end awurs end ays mēfēal er lann".

1

KC pp. 245-46; Mur. p. 118.

2

KC pp. 303-304; Mur. p. 169.

thwarted by local Mongols and had to visit the Great Khān Möngke to complain<sup>1</sup>. Probably, however, naxarar attempts to play off the two inimical Mongol states were not common.

It is interesting that at the very end of our period, after all of Tīmūr's decimations, enslavements and executions we find at least one naxarar seeking leverage from the rivalry of two strong powers. The Armenian governor of Erzinjan, called Taharten by Clavijo and T'axrat'an by T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, was blamed by Clavijo for causing strife and warfare between his Ottoman lord Bāyazīd, and Tīmūr:

Now the causes that led to the Sultan of the Turks having knowledge of the Mongol Tartars and what indeed brought Timur first into Asia Minor, where he afterwards fought and conquered Sultan Bayazid, the causes thereof, I say, were these. The lord of the city of Arzinjan was at that time as already explained, the prince Taharten: and his territories neighbored those of the Turk. The Sultan had lately become most avaricious to possess all that region, and more especially to be master of that strong castle of Camag which Taharten jealously guarded as his own. Sultan Bayazid thereupon was prompted to send to Taharten a message demanding of him that he should pay tribute, and also that he should deliver into his care that castle of Camag. To this Taharten replied that willingly would he pay tribute, acknowledging the Sultan as his overlord, but that the Castle of Camag he would not deliver over to the Turks. To Taharten the answer shortly came back that it would be for his peace to deliver it up, otherwise he would certainly lose both it and his whole territory. Now prince Taharten had by this time already heard of Timur and his mighty deeds, and how he was engaged waging war in Persia, where all the Persian princes had been subjugated. Taharten therefore sent envoys to Timur, with gifts and letters, beseeching him that he would

come to his aid against the Turk, and he offered to place both himself and his territories completely at the disposal and service of Timur. Timur on this, despatched an envoy to Sultan Bayasid with letters in which he informed the Sultan that prince Taharten was become his subject and vassal. Hence for his own honor he, Timur, could not allow aught of dishonor to be done to Taharten or the matter should be required at the Sultan's hands.<sup>n.l.</sup>

Another naxarar response to Mongol control was rebellion and armed resistance. The naxarar rebellions which already have been discussed in different contexts in this study, all were caused by Mongol excesses. Nonetheless, all of them failed because the Mongols controlled the loyalty of certain principal lords who informed on the conspirators. At times, Caucasian revolt amounted to little more than flight far into the inaccessible mountains, but on other occasions, the rebels did have some leverage or at least aid, be it the real or presumed assistance (mostly diplomatic) from the Golden Horde, or be it from alliance with Mongol rebels. The sources contain several instances of such entente cordiale between Caucasian and Mongol rebels<sup>2</sup>. Given the numerical superiority of Mongol troops, and their renowned discipline, and given the mountainous

<sup>1</sup> Clav. pp. 131-32.

<sup>2</sup> KC pp. 261-62; Mur. p. 133, also KC pp. 297-99; Mur. pp. 164-65.

terrain of Caucasia, such revolts always took the form of guerrilla warfare. It is noteworthy that despite the demonstrated exhaustion of Armenia during the 14th century, there still was some scattered resistance offered to Tīmūr:

...Now a pious tanutēr named Martiros, an extremely strong warrior from the village of Kołb [in northeastern Armenia], mercifull, a lover of the poor, went up onto Bardol mountain which others call T'akalt'u. With him were extremely manly and brave youths from the village. They saved all the Believers through a great battle and with the intrepid aiding power of mighty God, Jesus Christ, our Savior. And though [Timur's men] fought many times, they were unable to take that mountain. But subsequently [Martiros] was murdered by an unclean Turkmen named Sahat' --drowned in the waters of the Araz, far from human sight. 1.

In addition to Kołb, the Prošean city of Sahaponk', and Surmari and Bĭni also offered resistance to Tīmūr<sup>2</sup>. Most remarkable of all were the successes of the Georgian monarch against Tīmūr. In the early years of the 15th century, king Giorgi VII undertook a marauding expedition of revenge against Muslim settlements. It was reminiscent of amirpasalar Zak'arē's final campaign

---

1 TM pp. 17-18. The present writer regrets that he is unable to furnish the classical Armenian texts for TM. So my knowledge there is no copy of Sahnazarean's 1860 edition in the United States. The above passage has been extracted from a full translation of Mecop'ec'i's History done by the present writer, during the winter of 1976/77 in Erevan.

2 HAP vol. IV p. 25.

through Naxiĵewan, Juĵa, through Āzarbāĵjān to Mārand, Tabrīz and Qazvīn in 1211-12<sup>1</sup>.

Emigration of naxarars from Armenia was caused by two factors: the breakdown of conditions deemed essential by the mecatuns for international trade, and (from the inception of Islamization) anti-Christian terror aimed especially at the prominent and well-to-do. Emigration to escape Mongol domination probably began in the 1220's during the decade of chaos. Already by the time of the French Franciscan William of Rubruck's visit to Ani (1255), even the Zakarids were looking for

---

<sup>1</sup> "It was about this time [1405/6] that the king of Georgia of whom we have already spoken, came out in rebellion. He invaded the country round and about Ani and Erzerum, which is of Greater Armenia, and extended his raid down even to Tabriz, plundering and burning many villages and hamlets, spreading terror on all hands. The Moslems of Tabriz held that Prince Omar must of his duty march to their defence, but he failed to come. But next he sent in his place, giving him command in Tabriz, a certain great noble [of whom we have already spoken] a very old man, him whose name was Omar Toban, who at the head of some 5,000 horse had hitherto been stationed on the Georgian frontier of those parts. From the country round Tabriz troops were hurriedly collected, these numbering some 15,000 horse, and forthwith proudly marched through the streets of that city, where they made a very fine display. Then these all took their departure for the frontier in the region of the Alataq plains, which are of Greater Armenia. No sooner had king George heard of their approach than he marched out with 5,000 of his horsemen to encounter them; and coming fell on them at night. Taking them thus by surprise, he slew most of these men, while such as escaped fled back to Tabriz, where the terror and confusion of the Moslem folk became very great" (Clav. p. 323).

a way out:

...We came to the country of Sahensa (Šahnšah) once the most powerful Georgian prince, but now tributary to the Tartars, who have destroyed all its fortified places. His father, Zacharias by name, had got this country of the Armenians, for delivering them from the hands of the Saracens.

I took a meal with this Sahensa; and he showed me great politeness, as did his wife and his son called Zacharias, a very fine and prudent young man, who asked me, whether if he should come to you [the Pope], you would keep him with you; for so heavily does he bear the domination of the Tartars, that though he has abundance of all things, he would prefer to wander in foreign lands to bearing their domination. Moreover, they told me that they were sons of the Roman Church; and if the lord Pope would send them some assistance, they would themselves subject all the neighboring countries to the Church. 1.

The sources contain no references to emigration of naxarars and their dependents en masse, of the sort known from earlier times. Nor may much specific be said about emigration in the 13th century generally, beyond the fact that it occurred (and probably was widespread), because of a lack of information. Some 13th century colophons written by clerics from Greater Armenia merely mention the fact that the authors themselves fled from the Mongols, sometimes adding the name of an occasional lord who also left. Cilicia seems to have been a favorite refuge for many Greater Armenians, though colophons written in Armenian centers

in Italy are not unknown. In the 14th century, the Crimea became a favorite refuge for necatur merchants, and its trading capital of Kafa also became a major center of Armenian culture<sup>1</sup>.

Given the inextricable connection between the Church and the State in Armenia, it should come as no surprise that the powerful families diversified their talents and wealth into both areas in the 13-14th centuries. Just as in Arsacid times, in this period also the bishop of a given district usually was the brother or other close relation of the district's secular lord. When a given régime granted the Church tax-free status or other privileges, the secular lords attempted to transfer the family holdings to the (family) Church, to avoid paying taxes, or to obtain other advantages. Each of the major naxarar families groomed certain members (sometimes selected at birth) for specific offices in the Church. Their ideal was the situation obtaining in the late 13th century in Siwnik', ruled by the secular naxarar Elikum Orbelean. The metropolitan of Siwnik' was his brother, Step'annos<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example: 1233/34 col. Ališan, Hay. #318 "B", p.457; 1238/39 col. Ališan, #318 "C", p.458; 1239/40 col. Yov. Yiğ., pp. 936-37; 1240/41 col. Yov. Yiğ., pp. 941-42, to cite a few of the earlier ones. See T. M. Korkhmazian's Armianskaia miniatiura Kryma [Armenian Miniatures of Crimea] (Erevan, 1978).

<sup>2</sup> SO pp. 178-79.

With increasing frequency the 13th century inscriptions mention the ~~bestowing~~ of lands and villages on certain monasteries, and virtually all 14th century inscriptions speak of it. The granting of land to the naxararized churches was used as a device not only to avoid onerous land taxes but also as a means of retaining control of the district in the event of the naxarars' departure to another land, temporarily or permanently. The Arcrunids, it will be remembered, had made such an arrangement already in the 11th century when king Senek'erim quit Vaspurakan but retained control of numerous monasteries<sup>1</sup>. Over many centuries the Arcrunid Xedenekeans and Sefedineans did indeed retain control of some parts of Vaspurakan, especially Ałt'amar where they set up their own kat'olikos- in the early 12th century. It is not impossible that the vardapet Małak'ia of the late 14th century, mentioned by T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, was in eastern Armenia to keep an eye on the property of his prosperous family, which had moved to the Crimea some time before:

...[Małak'ia] was from the seaside city of Erim (Crimea), son of an extremely wealthy family. He left his inheritance and came to the great vardapet Yovhannes. Receiving from him the authority of vardapet, [Małak'ia] went to the district of Naxčuan and constructed Armenian monasteries. 2 .

1

See above pp. 167-68, and Appendix B p. 279.

2

ib. p. 15.



The same may be true of Malak'ia's teacher, vardapet Yovhannēs kaxik Orotneč'i, "son of the great prince Iwanē, from the line of the first princes of Siwnik"<sup>1</sup>. At the end of our period, the Spanish ambassador Clavijo reported on a similar situation. Enroute to Tīmūr in 1403, Clavijo lodged in the southeastern district of Maku with the Armenian lord of that mountainous area, a Roman Catholic named Nur ad-Dīn:

The governor [Nur ad-Dīn] further had at home there another son, younger than that other, and in conversation he informed us that this second son of his, not being a man of arms like his brother, but learned and a skilled grammarian in the Armenian language, he desired that should God grant us to return home from Samarqand passing by the way of this his castle, he would fain confide this youth to our care, to carry him with us to Spain. Then our King, who, he trusted might favor him, would recommend him to the Pope, beseeching his holiness to ordain him a bishop over his father's province. It is indeed a wonder how the Christians of this Castle of Maku hold their own thus surrounded by the Moslem folk and so far estranged from all Christian succour: they are in fact of the Armenian nation, but of the Roman Catholic belief, and they serve God in the orthodox rite. 2.

The above quotation has elements in common with Rubruck's remarks also. Šahnšah and Nur ad-Dīn both were attempting to ally with the might of the Catholic Church, to bring in a powerful foreign power to give them political

---

<sup>1</sup> TM pp. 14-15.

<sup>2</sup> Clav. p. 147.

leverage at home or (perhaps better) to secure the future existence of the family holdings--under control of the clerical rather than secular lords of the family.

With the Islamization of the Mongols, the naxarars were under direct pressure to convert. However, the polygamy of the late 13th century naxarars may indicate that some lords were easing into the Islamic practises of their Mongol overlords even before being obliged to apostasize. Perhaps they practised two religions. Specific references to the conversion of lords in contradistinction to the general conversion of the populace, abound from sources dating to the end of our period. Clavijs and T'ovma Mecop'ec'i both mention the Armenian prince Taharten, governor of Erznjan. His son by a daughter of the emperor of Trebizond, was a Muslim and (perhaps because of his faith), Tīmūr's governor of the same city<sup>1</sup>. Another probable Armenian lordly convert to Islam is the emir Ezdin of Van, whom T'ovma Mecop'ec'i described as being "of the line of king Senek'erim", i.e., of some Arcrunid background<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Clav. p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> TM p. 30.

The Tīmūrīds forced certain princes to convert. Bagarat, king of Georgia, was forced to convert, but the apostasy was only temporary, and to save his life<sup>1</sup>. In the late 14th century, Tīmūr's grandson, 'Umar, forced several conversions:

During the first year of his reign, he forcibly made to apostasize three princes of our people who had remained like a tiny cluster of grapes among us: the son of Iwane and grandson of Burt'el, Burt'el ter of Orotan, of the Orbelean family; his brother Smbat whom they took with his family to Samarqand (but subsequently, through divine mercy and their prayers they returned to their patrimony); the ter of Elegis named Tarsayic, son of Gorgon they caused to apostasize; the ter of Maku they detached from the false and diophysitic [beliefs] of Alt'armayut' iwn [Roman Catholicism], and the son of an azat (azatordi) named Azitan from Aic'uac' village in the Ayraratean district. Later, however, they repented and became true Believers in Christ and heirs of the Kingdom. 2.

The ter of Maku referred to in the above quotation probably is the first son of Clavijs's host, Nur ad-Dīn. Clavijs related that Nur ad-Dīn came to terms with Tīmūr, and pledged to serve in his army with 20 horsemen<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> TM p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> TM pp. 67-68.

<sup>3</sup> Clav. p. 145. Also see R. Hewsén, "The Meliks"(II), REA #X(1973/74) p. 299.

But this was not enough. Tīmūr demanded religious adhesion:

Next, Tīmūr, noting that the lord of the castle had so fine a son, it were, he said, indeed a pity the youth should be kept mewed up at home, and he, Timur, would receive him, carrying him off in his train to become the companion of his grandson. This prince, the grandson of Timur is named Omar Mirza, and he was at that time already established as governor ruling over the whole of Western Persia, in which region Maku is included. The young man whom Timur thus carried off in his train is at this present moment living with Omar Mirza, and has been raised to be a commander in his army. But they have forced him against his will to become a Moslem, having bestowed on him the name of Siurgatmish, and he now is captain of the guards of Omar Mirza. Outwardly he professes himself a Moslem: but not of free will, for at heart he is still a Catholic. <sup>1</sup>.

As a result of the unsettled, unsafe times, some lords of completely impregnable fortresses, unable to maintain themselves in any other way, turned to banditry. Prime sources of loot were the increasingly rare caravans passing over the bandit's lands, or even booty captured from Tīmūrids and Turkmens. Sometimes bandit lords operated alone, sometimes in alliance with others, Christian or Muslim. T'ovma Mecóp'ec'i speaks of one such mixed group of Kurdish Muslim and Armenian Christian brigands from Sasun and Xut' which looted a Tīmūrīd camp

---

<sup>1</sup>  
Clav. p. 146.

in southwestern Armenia in the early 1390's<sup>1</sup>. The Spanish ambassador Clavijo encountered Caucasian bandits both enroute to Erzincan from Trebizond in 1403, and on his return, again in northwestern Armenia and southwestern Georgia: "for though they are Armenians and profess to be Christians, all are robbers and brigands; indeed they forced us, before we were let free to pass, to give a present of our goods as toll for right of passage"<sup>2</sup>. The lord encountered in the Trebizond area in 1403, probably a Graeco-Georgian, was typical of this group of mountain lords:

He proceeded to explain to us that he lived in that barren land, where indeed we found him now at peace, but that he had continually to defend himself against the Turks who were his neighbors on all sides, against whom he was ever at war. Further he said he and his men had nothing to live on, except it were what they could get given them by those who passed through their country, or what they could come to by plundering the lands of their neighbors, and hence he, Cabasica, must now implore of us to give him some aid as a free gift in the form of money or goods. In answer we stated that we were ambassadors and no merchants, being envoys whom our master the King of Spain was sending to the Lord Timur, and that further we carried no goods with us except what we were bearing as gifts to Timur. That Tatar ambassador of Timur, who was our travelling companion, here broke in, saying that though he well knew the Emperor of Trebizond was the overlord of all that country, he was in fact none the less a vassal potentate tributary to Timur, wherefore it was incumbent

---

<sup>1</sup> TM p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Clav. p. 336.

on him, Cabasica, that we all should be allowed to pass those borders without let or hindrance. To this Cabasica, backed by his men, replied that this all might indeed be very true, but that they were in a state only able to exist by what they could obtain in the manner that had been set forth to us; averring that by necessity their stress of wherewithal to eat would cause them even to plunder and raid into the homelands of the Lord Timur himself.

1.

Despite the extremely bleak situation across the Armenian highlands at the end of the 14th century, the sources still report a few instances of secular and clerical Armenian lords enjoying some influence with the Tīmūrīds. Among the secular rulers belong the unnamed woman ruler of Igdir castle<sup>2</sup>, and the Armenian lord of Bayazid<sup>3</sup>. Another such lord was the Roman Catholic Nur ad-Dīn, mentioned earlier<sup>4</sup>. Among the clerical lords enjoying some influence with the Tīmūrīds belong the director of Mecop' monastery, Yovhannēs<sup>5</sup>, and the noted intellectual, vardapet Grigor Tat'ewac'i, who was a confidant of Tīmūr's son, Mīrān<sup>6</sup>.

---

1 Clav. p. 119.

2 Clav. 142.

3 Clav. p. 144: "This city was besieged by Timur some six years ago, but the lord of the same shortly came to terms with him agreeing to pay Timur tribute, who on his side promised not to let his Tartars enter the place. Neither was the lord of Bayazid, either of himself or with his men, bound to join and march with Timur".

4 Clav. 145.

5 TM p. 58.

6 TM p. 69.

At the beginning of this chapter it was mentioned that Adontz, Manandyan, and Toumanoff disagreed on the duration of the naxarar "system". Toumanoff placed its destruction in the 11th century, Adontz in the early 13th century and Manandyan, after the mid-14th century, though each of the scholars acknowledged that vestiges of the "system" survived into later times. From the quantitative standpoint, Toumanoff was quite right in placing the beginning of the end in the 11th century. After the Saljuq invasions, the number of remaining naxarar Houses (which had steadily declined from about 50 in the 5th century to 20 ca. 800 A.D.)<sup>1</sup> numbered about five: the Arcrunids, Bagratids, Mamikonids, Orbeleans, and Pahlawunids. From the standpoint of "naxarar ways" which Manandyan spoke of without defining, at the end of the 14th century there were still some "naxarars" alive in Armenia, as this chapter has attempted to demonstrate. Adontz, however, who wrote of a "system" destroyed in the early 13th century was incorrect in his hypothesis. To Adontz, hereditary tenure and seniority were fundamental features of this "system", yet he himself admitted that beginning already in the 5th century, the rule of seniority was being undermined. By the 10th century a fundamental change had occurred in the essence of the "system"<sup>2</sup>. What the Mongol invasions swept away

---

<sup>1</sup> Toumanoff, Studies, p. 227.

<sup>2</sup> Adontz, Armenia, p. 221.

was a lordly society, but one more sentimentally reminiscent of, than actually resembling, the Arsacid naxarars so brilliantly described by Adontz.



## CONCLUSION

This study has examined various aspects of Armenian history during the 13-14th centuries. Commencing with a review of the Armenian and non-Armenian sources (chapter one), the political and military history of Armenia in our period, and in the period immediately preceding it was presented in chapter two. The third and final chapter concerned Armenia's nobility, the naxarars.

From 1220, when the Mongols first appeared in the Caucasus, to 1385 when Tokhtamysh invaded, a period of 165 years had elapsed. During that time different parts of Armenia had experienced no less than 12 foreign invasions, and the severity of Mongol rule had triggered three Armeno-Georgian rebellions. Mongol centrifugation had resulted in two major uprisings of Mongol nomads resident in the Caucasus itself. Moreover, with the collapse of the Īl-Khānīd state in the 1330's, a condition of "internal war" had existed in most parts of historical Armenia, as mutually antagonistic bands (and armies) of Mongol, Turkmen, and Kurdish nomads fought one another and the sedentary native population. Religious persecution and economic chaos had long since become the norm. In 1386-87, 1394-96, and 1399-1403, Armenia was subjected to what were perhaps the most brutal invasions yet, led or directed by Tīmūr.

By focussing on the information regarding each of the major invasions provided in the Armenian, Georgian, and relevant non-Caucasian sources, the specific features of each have been set forth.

Each successive invasion--Saljuq (11th century, introduced as a prototypical example), Khwarāzmian, Mongol and Tīmūrid--pushed before it, brought along with it, or dragged in its wake into Asia Minor, thousands of virtually uncontrollable nomadic warriors who (when totally unchecked) devastated the cities, searching for plunder, destroyed the countryside and the complex irrigation systems, turning cultivated fields into pasturage for their sheep herds, and reduced the possibilities for internal and international trade by infesting the trade routes between cities, and attacking caravans. Following the noted Mongolist, Bertold Spuler, we have described this element as Turkmen, under which is understood not necessarily or solely a Turkic or Turcophone population, but rather that plunder-hungry element among the nomads, in contradistinction to those forces interested in the establishment of stable forms of government, and a sedentary or semi-sedentary existence. Centralizing forces within the various Turco-Mongol societies described, were obliged to support a very delicate balance. On the one hand, the warlike Turkmens were the best, most determined fighters, and so were necessary for victorious expeditions. On the other hand, the Turkmens' impulse to

destroy and move on had to be fought--sometimes literally--in order for the more sedentary elements to impose taxation on the conquered peoples, and attempt to exploit them in a more systematic fashion. But eventually the Turkmens were victorious, destroying the organized Turkish and Mongol states.

As was pointed out in the final chapter, the wild, unrestrained, plunder-hungry element was present from the very first, during the Mongol invasions and of course during the domination of Armenia (beginning in 1236). In a sense, even the "centralizing elements", or let us say "representatives of the 'central government'" became "Turkmenized". The Mongols did not know the meaning of fair taxation; application of the principle of peaceful exploitation through taxation was not well understood by the rulers of the various nomadic societies, and as a result, conquered countries were squeezed dry of human and material resources. With the Islamization of the Mongols, and the ethnic fusion of Turkic and Mongol groups, all aspects of life became further "Turkmenized". The illegal, extraordinary exactions placed upon taxed communities (reported in the sources almost from the first) were thereby given a religious justification. Once again under the Mongols, as had happened during the invasions of the Saljuqs and the Khwarāzmians, fanatical Islam was wed to the nomads'

lust for booty. From toward the end of the 13th century to beyond the end of the 14th century, anti-Christian persecutions prevailed almost uninterruptedly. What earlier had been punishment meted out to an occasionally recalcitrant naxarar became the generalized fate of all Christians refusing to convert. Nomads of all kinds of backgrounds, circulating in different parts of the Armenian highlands, attacked churches, monasteries, wealthy and poor Christians.

During the resurgence and expansion of Georgia in the late 12th and early 13th centuries, the Georgian monarchs used three control mechanisms in dealing with the nobles: (1) manipulation of precedence among the lords and its corollary, the co-optation of allegiance; (2) circumvention of the lords, and (3) de-naxararization. By the end of the 12th century the Georgian Crown had managed temporarily to rein in the most dangerous centrifugal forces--but only for the moment. In that brief historical moment (from the last decades of the 12th century until ca. 1236) Georgian culture flourished and blossomed. Under the aegis of the Georgian Crown and the Armeno-Georgian family of Zak'arean/Mxargrceli, Armenia recovered much of its irredenta, and flourished as a united state.

The nobility of the Zak'arid revival consisted of different elements: men of ambition and military talents from newly-arisen families, who were rewarded by their Zak'arid overlords with grants of land and/or the rights of administration; mecatun merchants; the remnants of the ancient dynastic families: Mamikonids, Bagratids, Arcrunids, Orbeleans, and others, who in the changed situation of the early 13th century all became Zak'arid vassals; and the clerical nobility representing the different Armenian churches.

It must be stated that the Zak'arid revival was of such short duration that the achievement--a centralized Armenian state under Georgian overlordship--is difficult to evaluate. As we illustrated, during the Zak'arid revival and throughout the 13th century there were numerous conflicts among the naxarars (secular and clerical) over land. The lords in this period were not quarreling over more orchards and choice hunting grounds, but over the tolls for right of passage from the trade routes crisscrossing the highlands. There were other superficial similarities with Arsacid naxararism, but we stress that they were more apparent than real. The feud, an important feature of Arsacid naxararism, existed in the 13th century as well, but the obligation of blood vengeance had been

replaced by an elaborate schedule of payments of "blood price" with each class of society having its monetary worth, written into a law code. The old term for the inalienable clan patrimony, the hayrenik', which in Arsacid times had meant land, in the 13th century referred to both moveable and immoveable property, hereditary or purchased, and included money and shares in business enterprises as well. The service obligation of a subordinate to his lord in this period did indeed include military service, but the vassals also paid taxes in cash. Hereditary tenure and seniority were not the main features of this society. Many of the principals of the day were appointees of the Zak'arids, rewarded for their talents. The Zak'arids established marriage ties with the most prominent of the old prestigious families of eastern Armenia. Thus, for a brief moment, it appears that a feudal "command" type of society had been generated--with the principals appointed by the Zak'arids and firmly under their control.

In this connection, it is most interesting to note certain remarks made by Adontz toward the end of his study, as he compared and contrasted his interpretation of the genesis of the naxarars with the legendary account provided by the late 8th century antiquarian, Movsēs Xorenac'i:

...Our own analysis justifies [Xorenac'i's interpretation since it too has shown that the naxarar system did in fact consist first of native [i.e. dynastic] and later of foreign [i.e. Arsacid] elements. The fundamental difference lies in the fact that according to Xorenac'i, the great naxarar-doms were descended from single individuals, while in our analysis they were derived from previously independent ethnic groups.

It is evident from the examples just cited that for Xorenac'i two qualities were the bases of naxarar status: service and nobility, i.e., superiority of blood... In Xorenac'i's opinion, the aristocracy consisted of the more ancient families, primarily those presumably descended from Hayk, which were already present in Armenia at the time of the coming of the Arsacids. According to us, the aristocracy consisted of the houses which had developed through the disintegration of tribal relationships.

For Xorenac'i as for us, land tenure also provided the material basis of the naxarar system. Promotion to the rank of naxarar according to him was nothing more than a grant of lands. Nobility and naxarar status were synonymous concepts for him for the very reason that all nobles possessed lands, and lands were granted in hereditary tenure, n.l.

We maintain that for the early 13th century, both Adontz and Xorenac'i were correct. Zak'arē came very close to Xorenac'i's first Arsacid king, "Vałaršak" in establishing a régime. In a sense, he generated new families through association with his own. But curiously, the tendency toward convergence--mecatuns investing in land, and the remnants of the few ancient dynastic families diversifying into trade--coupled with that strong hereditarizing

1

Adontz, pp. 369-70.

principle which has never ceased to operate in Armenian society--led to a "re-seeding" of what might seem like classical Arsacid naxararism, but in fact was a structure resting on a completely different base. It is very important to underline the fact that in a country with as developed a historical consciousness as Armenia, and as ancient a literature, a certain amount of evocation of the antique past pervades many sources dating from much later times. Just as the Sasanian Persians hearkened back to their Achaemenid "forbears" and adopted certain ceremonial and/or sentimental forms to stress this identification, so too did the Bagratids and Zak'arids look to the Arsacids for symbolic identification. Thus certain similarities of terminology found in Arsacid and Zak'arid sources must be analyzed on an individual basis, before any assumptions of identity may be entertained.

It is important in this regard to note that on the eve of the Turco-Mongol invasions of the 13th century, the term naxarar already designated different types of lords, just as (in a later period) the term melik did. As Hewsan noted:

By the end of the Mongol period, the Caucasian social structure had to all intents and purposes been destroyed in Armenia; its princely houses exterminated,



submerged by the egalitarianism of Islam which recognized no princely dignity, or incorporated into the surviving Caucasian social structure in Georgia. Only here and there, notably in the mountains of Karabagh and Siwnik<sup>1</sup> some vestiges of the old princely houses survived and retained some measure of local autonomy. This social disintegration is clear from the disappearance of the old Armenian princely titles, so important in the Caucasian social system, and their replacement by one new and flexible term, 'melik', the very all-purposeness of which is an indication that the fixed social framework was no longer there. It would appear then, that the title 'melik' was used simply to designate any of the few surviving members of the Armenian nobility of old who retained any kind of social position in a world which had become the world of Islam; whether one had been a naxarar (dynast) or merely an azat (member of the gentry). Indeed, as we shall see, the term was applicable to municipal ethnarchs and, in time, it would appear, even to mere village chiefs. 1.

We might ask, parenthetically, if indeed even in Arsacid times the term naxarar had a single sense or meaning.

It was pointed out in chapter three that as regards control mechanisms, the Mongols invented nothing new. Furthermore, naxarar reactions to the different control techniques used by the Mongols before and after their Islamization were varied, but also contained no new elements. Naxarar reaction to the invasions was clear: when united military resistance proved impossible, the naxarars holed up in their mountain fortresses; when

<sup>1</sup> R. Hewsen, "The Meliks"(I) p. 293.

they learned that the Mongols spared those submitting peaceably, the naxarars submitted, making separate often highly advantageous arrangements with their new overlords. As for the domination, naxarar reactions to Mongol control techniques in the 13-14th centuries may be grouped under five major headings. The lords: (1) attempted when possible to exploit the rivalry between different centers of Mongol authority; (2) rebelled, when feeling themselves sufficiently powerful and when driven to it by Mongol excesses; (3) emigrated from the Armenian highlands in large numbers; (4) Islamized in large numbers, and (5) withstood everything, retaining the Christian faith and also a certain leverage with the Turco-Mongol régimes. Some lords of totally impregnable fortresses became caravan-looters and bandits. Other lords sometimes were able to retain certain privileges and even family lands through the process of giving their lands to religious establishments under the control of clerical representatives of the secular lord's own family.

Robert Bedrosian  
Long Branch, New Jersey,  
1978

## APPENDIX A

Supplementary Notes on the 11-13th Century Naxarars

Aspects of the Saljuq invasions and domination are dealt with in chapter two of this study. Here we shall examine features relating directly to the princes in this period, continuing through to the resurgence of Georgia. Supplementary information on institutions of the Zak'arid period likewise is provided. It should be noted, remarkable as it is, that despite Byzantium's inept and disastrous policies vis-à-vis the Armenians, the Saljuqs did in fact meet some Armenian armed resistance. In 1042, for example, Xul Xaçi Arcruni of T'ofnawan attempted a heroic but futile resistance against 15,000 Turks in Vaspurakan. In 1042/43, an unspecified number of Turks raiding Bjni in northeastern Armenia were defeated by king Gagik Bagratuni and Grigor Magistros Pahlawuni, son of former sparapet Vasak<sup>1</sup>. In 1053 the Armenians of Surmari destroyed an army of 60,000 Turks<sup>2</sup>. The size of Turkmen detachments going against different parts of Armenia varied from about 5,000 to perhaps 50,000 troops. While these armies are not large by modern standards, it must be remembered that the Saljuqs were a determined

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 444.

<sup>2</sup> The numbers of combatants, even when given are probably quite inflated. According to Ibn al-Athir, in 1048 a Byzantine army of resistance led by Armenian naxarars in Byzantine service was defeated by the Saljuqs in Basen and prince Liparit Orbelean was captured and taken to Persia

"cohesive" fighting force. The same may not be said of the Armenian and Greek forces of Asia Minor.

During and after the invasions, some princes, not wishing to emigrate, or unable to, took to a wandering life, hiding in caves, in some cases perhaps waiting for opportunities to avenge themselves<sup>1</sup>. Others made accommodation with the Saljuqs and retained certain limited rights. Furthermore, the benevolent Saljuq sultan Malik--Shāh granted the Armenian churches tax-free status in 1090, upon the request of the kat'olikos. Probably some of the naxarar families were able to retain control of their lands through the clergy. In the absence of the naxarar confederational State, the naxararized Church became the medium of communication for the families. Indeed Subat Sparapet described kat'olikos Grigor Tia Pahlawuni (1173-93) as being "like a king" in wealth. References in other sources also suggest a partial restoration of lands and privileges under various Muslim overlords. Matthew of Edessa, for example, describing the situation in the time of Malik Ismael Ibn Yāqūt (1085-93) wrote "everyone ruled his patrimony in his [Yāqūt's] time (amenayn ok' tiral).

together with 100,000 captives (HAP pp. 449-50).

1

C.J.F. Dowsett, "The Albanian Chronicle of Mxit'ar Goš" BSOAS vol. 21(1958) p. 484.

ēr hayreneac' iwroc' yawurs nora)". According to Vardan Arewelc'i, when the Shaddādid Manūchihr ruled Ani-Širak, he recalled from exile Grigor Pahlawuni and restored his holdings<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, Armenians, Greeks and Georgians serving in the armies of the Shāh-Armens and the sultans of Iconium/Konya also received iqtas--originally conditional landholds which quickly became hereditary<sup>2</sup>.

The situation of shock and confusion which many cavalrymen or azats, the "gentry", found themselves in, dispossessed from their lands, was described by the late 11th century author Aristakēs Lastivertc'i: "The cavalry wanders about lordlessly, some in Persia, some in Greece, some in Georgia. The sepuh brigade of azats has left its patrimony and fallen from wealth; they growl wherever they happen to be, like lion cubs in their lairs"<sup>3</sup>. Members of the azatagundk' hayoc', the cavalry of Armenia, clustered around successful bandits like Goł Vasil or Philaretus

---

<sup>1</sup> For references and discussion, HAP pp. 497-98.

<sup>2</sup> HAP pp. 495-96.

<sup>3</sup> AL p. 60: "Hecelazōrn antērunč ērjeal omn i Parss, omn i Yoyns, omn i Virs. Sepuh gundn azatac' eleal i hayreneac', ankeal i Coxut ene, mfnčen ur ew en ibrew zkorwns afiwuc' i xstis iwreanc'."

Varažnunik' in lands southwest of Armenia. Others found a very warm reception in Georgia. During the reign of David the Restorer (1089-1125), Georgia became a haven for Armenian lords and lordless azats. Matthew of Edessa says that David "received and loved the Armenian people. The remnants of the Armenian forces assembled by him"<sup>1</sup>. He also built a special city, Gori, for the refugees: "And he [David] established churches and many monasteries. He named the city Gōfa [Gori] and received all the Armenian people with great joy and gladness"<sup>2</sup>. According to the old medieval Armenian translation of the History of K'art'li ("Juanšēr"), David knew Armenian, and had as his father-confessor the Monophysite vardapet Sarkawag from Halbat monastery<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> One of David's wives was Armenian, and his son Demitre was the issue of that union. MEd p. 447: "Af sa žořovec'an mnač'eal zork'n Hayoc'".

<sup>2</sup> MEd pp. 447-48: "ew sa šineac' k'alak' Hayoc' i vašxarhn Vrac', ew hastateac' ekelec' is ew vanorays basums, ew anuaneac' zanun k'alak' in Gawray. ew uner mecaw uraxut'eamb ew c'ncut eamb zamenayn azgn Hayoc''".

<sup>3</sup> Juanšēr pp. 122-23: "Furthermore, he wanted to unite the Armenians and Georgians [religiously]. He summoned Yovhannes, kat'olikos of K'art'li, and Arsenios K'art'lec'i, translator of Georgian and Greek, and the bishops and vardapets of Armenia, and held a meeting. They examined [matters] from morning until evening, but did not accept each other".

The emigration of Armenians to Georgia, Cilicia, and other parts of the Middle East led to a phenomenon we might call the internationalization of the great families. There were Georgian Bagratids, Armenian Bagratids, Albanian Bagratids, and Graeco-Saljuq Bagratids, and the same applied to the Arcrunids and Orbeleans. The Pahlawunids in particular internationalized. They were hereditary archbishops of Ani from the 11-13th centuries, and also owned property in Mesopotamia and Cilicia, where in the 12th century they became kat'olikoi. In the 12th century, another branch of the Pahlawunids settled in Egypt and acquired so much influence as veziers, that anti-Armenian riots took place in several Egyptian cities<sup>1</sup>. It should be noted, however, that while the internationalization of the great families could and did lead to new trading opportunities and the accumulation of great wealth, such was not always the case. Often the different branches of a given family were in bitter rivalry with each other.

\*

In dealing with the Georgian nobility, the Bagratid kings of Georgia utilized many of the same methods as did foreign rulers: circumvention of the dynasts whenever possible,

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP pp. 516-18, 507, 509-510.

manipulation of the nobles' precedence, and "de-naxarar-ization"--removal of the lords. During the 10-12th centuries, Georgian monarchs attempted to circumvent the autochthonous dynastic nobility by elevating to official positions, persons of non-noble origin. So many non-nobles (uaznoni) were thus elevated to noble status (aznauroba) that in the 11th century Georgian sources a new term, alzebulni ("the raised") appeared to designate this growing body<sup>1</sup>. On the military front, the monarchs attempted to circumvent powerful Georgian dynasts by relying on foreign mercenaries (Caucasian mountaineers, Qipchaq Turks,<sup>2</sup> Russians), the lesser nobility, and the increasingly influential Armenian émigré element. The availability of non-noble and foreign elements probably gave the Georgian Bagratids more leverage in dealing with dynasts than had been the case in Bagratid Armenia.

Apparently Georgian monarchs also were able to manipulate precedence among the nobles more advantageously than their Armenian cousins. Occupancy of the office of commander-in-chief of the army (the amirspasalarate) illustrates this. Throughout much of the 12th century to 1155, the amirspasalars tended to be chosen from the mighty, rebellious Georgian branch of the Orbeleans. In the 1120's the Crown tried

<sup>1</sup> Allen p. 229.

<sup>2</sup> On the Qipchaqs in Georgia, see M.D. Lordkipanidze, Istoriia Gruzii Xi-nachala XIII veka (Tbilisi, 1974).



to counter Orbēlean influence by advancing the Abulet'isjes; and in the 1130's the Armenian Kiwrikan Bagratids<sup>1</sup>. In 1155 king David V tried to check the Orbēleans' power by removing them from the amirspasalarate and giving that office to the Orbēleans' principal Georgian rivals, the Abulet'isjes, to whom other important duties had been given<sup>2</sup>. Orbēleans, however, poisoned the king and regained the office, but after amirspasalar Iwanē Orbēli's abortive revolt in 1176-77, the office was given to a Qipchaq Turk named Qubasar. In 1184, the Gamrekelis were elevated to the amirspasalarate, and several years later the Armenized Kurdish family of Zak'arean/Mxargrceli<sup>3</sup>. Thus prior to the advent of the Zak'arids, the monarch was able to manipulate precedence by rewarding of office, although from the above it should be clear that the struggle against the dynasts was a continuous ongoing contest. The monarch could never rest or relax vigilance.

---

<sup>1</sup> H.G.Margaryan, "Miifeodalakan payk'are Georgi III-i Zamanak ev K'urd amirapete [The Inter-Feudal Struggle in the Time of Georgi III, and the Amirapet K'urd]", Lraber #11 (1975)p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Allen p. 253.

In the 12th century the Georgian Crown also attempted de-naxararization. This was aimed primarily at the Bagratids' most powerful rivals, the Orbeleans. In 1176-77, the Orbeleans, hoping to seize the throne, rebelled with the support of many Armenian princes (including the Zak'areans, who were Orbelid vassals at the time)<sup>1</sup>. When the rebellion was put down, the entire Orbelean family (excepting two or three males) was exterminated, and the family assets were confiscated<sup>2</sup>. The Georgian Bagratids also practised a less drastic form of de-naxararization, namely the forcible exile of opponents. In the 11th century, the Georgian Bagratids fought their Armenian Kiwrikan cousins, the "kings" of Lori. According to Kirakos Ganjakec'i:

Kiwrikē Bagratuni, who was from the town of Lori, having opposed the Georgians all his life, kept his patrimony (hayrenik') intact. But after his death [ca. 1090] his sons Dawit' and Abas were deceived by the Georgians and rose and went and received from them as a heritage Tawuš and Macnaberd and other places; then, after some days, the Persians took back Tawuš, and they dwelt in Macnaberd. 3.

1 Margaryan, pp. 51-52.

2 SO pp. 128-35.

3 KG pp. 151-52: "Isk Kiwrikē Bagratuni, or i Lōtē k'atak'i, zamanayn zamanaks iwr kac eal enddem vrac, i hastatut ean paher zhayrenis iwr. Ew yet mahuan nora ordik iwr dawealk' i vrac elealk' i tane hayreneac, gnac in i parsiks, Dawit' ew Abas, ew afnun i noc ane i zarangut' iwn zTawuš ew zMacnaberd ew zayl tejis. Apa yet awurc' afun darjeal parsikk' i noc ane zTawuš, ew nok a bnaken i Macnaberd..."

The Armenophile David III who ruled Georgia for less than a year (1155/56-1156/57) "showed such benevolence as to send for the King Kiwrikē, son of King Dawit' Bagratuni, and promise to return to him his patrimony which his ancestors had taken away from him; and thus he sent him back with presents, and arranged a meeting"<sup>1</sup>. According to indications in the Albanian Chronicle of Mxit'ar Goš, the Arcrunids who held the position of mayor (amirapet, šahap) of Tiflis and also owned lands at Kayean and Mahkan-aberd, were expelled from the kingdom under king Giorgi III (1156/57-1184), though Giorgi's successor T'amar restored them in their holdings<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dowsett, op.cit., p. 488.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. pp. 488-89: "When he became king, Giorgi made to seize Prince Vasak, for he bore him a grudge, for when he was governor of the town he did not honour him as much as his brother Dawit' and would not serve and obey him; other rpinces of Georgia also speaking ill of him, Vasak fled with his brothers and went to T'iodupolis which is now called the town of Karin [Erzerum]. And the emir named Saltux received him with joy and honor, for when Saltux was captured by the Georgian army whilst he begeiged the town of Ani and was brought before King Demetre in Tiflis, Vasak did him many services; because of this, he honored them with gifts and granted them authority over many villages. And having been there for some months, Vasak died and was buried in the church called Astuacacin (Mother of God) in the town. And his standard and clarior and authority were given to his brother called K'urd, and he remained there in great esteem".

As a result of territorial expansion, especially southwest into historical Armenia, the Georgian monarchy had at its disposal an ample fund of land. Choice sites especially in the Armeno-Georgian borderlands were available for gifts to court officials as rewards for military or other services, or to guarantee loyalty. Now the Crown intended such land gifts to be conditional, that is, they were given to a particular individual for the duration of his life or of his tenure. Such was the situation with the district of Lofē and the amirspasalarate. In 1118 Lofē was Orbēlean property. After the dispossession of the Georgian Orbēleans in 1176-77, Lofē was confiscated and given to the amirspasalar Xubasar. When Xubasar was removed from office in 1184, T'amar left him in all of his holdings except Lofē, by now considered the property of the amirspasalar<sup>1</sup>. The fact remains, however, that with time, just as appointed offices (such as the amirspasalarate) tended to become hereditary, so did those conditional landholds (such as Lofē) become hereditary within one family (Zak'areans).

1

Margaryan, p. 49. Margaryan notes that Kayean until 1176-77 belonged to prince Hasan., from 1185-91, to Vardan Dadian. After 1191 it belonged to Iwane Zak'arean. He suggests that Kayean went to the holder of the office of msaxurt'uxuc'es, just as Lore went to the amirspasalar (p. 59).

While the study concerns the 13-14th centuries and not merely the Zak'arid restoration, we feel obliged to make some mention of Zak'arid institutions. These institutions have been examined thoroughly by Babayan, most recently. Regrettably, details are lacking concerning the precise workings of political administration in the immediately pre-Mongol period. The brothers Zak'arē and Iwanē, both notable generals, also held official positions within the Georgian court. Zak'arē was the commander-in-chief of the army (amirspasalar) as of 1191, and the mandaturt'-uxuc'es from 1203 on; while his brother, first the msaxurt'-uxuc'es (foremost vezier at court) became atabeg in 1212, an office which was instituted within the Georgian court at Iwanē's own request<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 545; S. Eremyan, Amirspasalar Zak'aria Erkaynabazuk (Erevan, 1944) p. 17: mandaturt'-uxuc'es: "vezier of the seal and head of the queen's bodyguard". The following is a partial listing of Zak'arid family titles compiled from inscriptions and colophons.

- d.1212, Zak'arē mand. + amirsp.      atabek Iwanē (d.1227)  
 1228/29 (son) Sahnsah (d.1261), mand.      (son)Awag, amirsp. (VT p.71)  
 1230/31 amirsp. (VTpp. 73-74)  
 1231/32 amirsp. (VT p. 74)  
 1246/47 spasalar (VT p. 90)  
 1251/52 amirsp. (CIA v. I p. 15)  
 1258/59 atabek and amirsp. (CIA v. I p. 64).  
mand. (VT p. 101)
- 1273/74 atabek+amirsp. paron Sadun (VT p. 115) (d.1284)  
 1285/86 spasalar Xarkrceal "son of the great Sahnsah (VT p. 126).  
 1291/92 amirsp. Mxargrjel, son of Sahnsah (VT pp. 140-41).  
 1300/1 paronut' iwn of atabek amirsp. Sahnsah (CIA v. I p. 68).  
 1321 atabek Sahnsah, married to his cousin Xwandze (VT p. 160).  
 1336/37 atabek Varham (brother of above), paron of parons (VT pp. .  
 1342/43 patron atabek Varham (VT p. 167).  
 1358/59 atabek Zaza (VT pp. 169-70)  
 1396/97 in the paronut' iwn of atabek Iwanē (14CC p. 614).

In the view of L. H. Babayan, the nature of the Zak'arid brothers' service to the Georgian Crown was primarily of a military sort. Armenian lands recaptured from the Turks, he suggests, did not pay taxes to Georgia, but to the Zak'arids who sometimes are styled "kings", "Caesars", and "šahnšahs" in the Armenian sources, apparently in recognition of this<sup>1</sup>.

Within the vast territories under their jurisdiction the two Zak'arid brothers apparently established many of the same offices as existed in the Georgian Court. The men chosen by them to fill these offices were those same individuals who had been instrumental as warriors in the reconquest of Armenian lands. The service (caṣayut'iwn) tendered the Zak'arids by their appointees consisted of military aid and the payment of taxes. Thus, in return for his service, Zak'arē titled Vaçe [Vačutean] his "prince of princes"<sup>2</sup>. Members of the Xaçen aristocracy served as Zak'arid hejubs, chamberlains, court directors, and guardians of Zak'arid children<sup>3</sup>. Prince Bubak, Iwanē's subordinate, is styled "prince of princes" and "the great

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 544, VT p. 47; occasionally Zak'arid women are styled queens: VT pp. 71, 74; X. pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> HAP p. 547

<sup>3</sup> HAP p. 550.

1

sparapet" in the sources . As Babayan notes, Bubak also was known by the Georgian title of msaxurt'-uxuc'es--the same title originally held by Iwanē in the Georgian Court<sup>2</sup>.

---

1

VT p. 51.

2

HAP p. 549. The following is a partial listing of 13-14th century titles mentioned in inscriptions and colophons.

- 1207/8 Vače, "prince of princes" (VT pp. 48,58).  
 [1217/18] " " (VT p. 61).
- 1210/11 "the great sparapet Bubak" (CIA v. IV p. 69).  
 1214/15 "the great prince of princes, K'urd" (VT p. 56).
- 1219/20. Vasak Xalbakean, "kołmnaph(lieutenant)[of the lands]'  
 1223/24 ~~from Gafni to Bardsbat~~ (CIA v. III p. 123).  
 Prince of princes Bubak (VT p. 57).
- 1225/26 "I, Dawit'...atabek of the great and mighty prince Sadun" (VT p. 69).
- 1228/29 hečup Grigor (VT pp. 71-72).  
 1230/31 K'ap ik...general of amirspasalar Šahnšah (VT pp.73-74).  
 1232/33 Colophon, Yov.Yiš., pp. 886-87 "prince of princes patron Xawfas".
- 1236/37 Col.Yov.Yiš., pp. 909-911: "prince of princes patron Dawit' Sot[o]jkanc', and his son the brave and renowned patron of patrons Grigor".
- 1243/44 prince of princes K'urd (VT p. 86).  
 1244/45 ! atabek and amirspasalar Xut'eubul (VT p. 87).  
 1244/45 K'urd, prince of princes (VT p. 87).  
 1248/49 Hasan Jalal's wife Mamk'an "daughter of the king of Bałk" (VT pp. 92-93).
- 1251/52 "I, Mamk'an, queen, wife of [Hasan]Jalal Dawl[a] (VT p. 96).
- 1251/52 kołmnakal Tarsayıč, prince of princes,..."brother of king Smbat" (VT p. 94).  
 1252/53 "king Jalal Dawl[a]" (VT p. 96).  
 1260/61 Smbat "prince of princes" (CIA v. III p. 218 foldout).  
 1282/83 "the great asparapet Varham" (CIA v. III p. 50; VT pp. 123-24).
- During the 1280's many inscriptions begin using the terms paron and paronut'awn:
- 1289/90 "prince of princes, paron Bult'ay" (CIA v.I p. 22).  
 1295/96 "prince of princes Burt'el" (VT p. 136).  
 1296/97 "in the paronut'awn of the prince of princes Grigor" (CIA v. IV p. 355; also VT p. 139).

This lends credence to the view that the Zak'arids created a partial microcosm of the Georgian Court hierarchy on their own lands.

Other important offices (gorcakalut'iwnk') fleetingly referred to in the sources are the kołmnakalut'iwnk' or lieutenancies. In Zak'arid Armenia there were three of them, held by three major families: in Siwnik', the Orbeleans, in Ayrarat the Vaçuteans, and in Vayoc' Jor the

- 
- 1296/97 Mina khatun, the royal queen, daughter of the great lieutenant of Albania, Jalal (CIA v.III p. 237; VT p. 138).
- 1307 Colophon, 14CC p.42, prince of princes Burt'el.
- 1307 Wife of Hasan the asparapet of Armenia (CIA v.III p.76; VT p. 154).
- 1322 Col.14CC p. 166; "in the generalship and principedom of this district [Glajor] of Burt'el and Amir Hasan".
- 1324 Col. 14CC p. 182, "the king of Georgia and Greater Armenia, Gawrg, the prince of princes of the House of Siwnik', spayapet Burt'el".
- 1337/38 Col.14CC p. 292, "for the paron of parons, Pēšgēn, heir of the royal line of Greater Armenia and his son Blikum, 'born in the purple'".
- 1338/39 Kurd Anberdec'i, prince of princes (VT p. 166).
- 1348/49 Col. 14CC p. 369, "prince of princes Bešken and Ivane", sons of deceased paron Burt'el.
- 1341/42 Col. 14CC p. 328: "in the consulship and sparapet-ut'iwn of Armenia of Biwrt'el [Orbelean].
- 1400/1 Col.14CC p. 632, "the principedom of paron Smbat and Burdel".



Isabakean-Prošians. Babayan reasonably suggests that the kolmnakals were endowed with some administrative-judicial powers<sup>1</sup>. The same author believes that the amiras or emirs were city mayors who stood at the head of an elaborate but poorly-understood governing body which included clergy and wealthy laymen. It is clear from inscriptions that at times even the administrative heads of large villages were appointed directly from the top, in one case by Iwanē himself<sup>2</sup>. The sources also contain a welter of terms such as tanutēr, gaherec' iṣṣan, patronac' patron and others, some known from the dawn of Armenian writing, others new. However, the manner in which the real content of such terms changed over time is not clearly known. Often titles such as šahnšah or marzban appear as the given names of individuals who held titled official positions, adding to the confusion<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> HAP p. 552.

<sup>2</sup> HAP p. 553; VT pp. 50, 52, 68.

<sup>3</sup> The following are some random examples of the confusion resulting from the use of titles as proper names.

1206/7 amirspasalar Zak'arē calls himself Zak'arē Šahnšah (VT p. 47).

1208/9 Šahnšah Zak'aria (CIA v.I p. 6; VT p. 49; CIA v.I p. 5; VT p. 49).

1209/10 "in the world reign of the Šahnšahs Zak'arē and Iwanē" (VT p. 50).

1210/11 Šahnšah Zak'aria (CIA v. I p. 55).

1211/12 Marčpan, son of Sargis Hamazaspeanc' (VT p. 52).

1212/13 Šahnšah Zak'aria (VT p. 54).

1215/16 Šahnšah Zak'aria, son of Šahnšah Sargis (CIA v.I p.2).

1220/21 amirspasalar Šahnšah Sargis (meaning Zak'are's son, Šahnšah) (CIA v.I p. 17).

1221/22 I, Marčpan, son of Sargis... (VT p. 64).

Furthermore, since the political reality of the time was Armeno-Georgian and not exclusively Armenian, sometimes Georgian titular is used alongside the Armenian, increasing the confusion<sup>1</sup>.

- 
- 1232/33 Col. Yov. Yiš., pp. 886-87, "the Caesars of Armenia Georgia, and all Abxazia".
- 1234/35 "I, T'aguhi, wife of Sarap'sah (VT p. 78).  
1234/35 "I, T'ayk T'aguhi, daughter of Sarap'sah (VT pp. 78, 112).
- 1243/44 Hasan Jalal's son is named At'abak (VT p. 86).  
1245/46 "Aslanbeg, son of Maropan" (VT pp. 88-89).  
1252/53 "I, Smbat, son of Hejub" (VT p. 96).  
1276/77 At'abak, lord of Kačen (VT p. 118).  
1281/82 T'aguhi, daughter of the presbyter tēr (lord) Sahak (VT p. 122).  
1293/94 Hejub's brother's son (VT p. 136).  
1320 Hečup (CIA v. IV p. 123; VT p. 159).

1

For example:

- 1206/7 amirspasalar Zak'arē calls himself the zawrapet of Armenia and Georgia (VT p. 47).  
1211/12 Zak'aria "amirspasalar of Armenia and Georgia" (VT p. 53).  
1214/15 Awag, the "coronant of Georgia" (VT p. 56).  
1219/20 Iwane, atabek of Armenia and Georgia (VT p. 62).  
1223/24 "the amirspasalarate of Armenia and Georgia of Sahnsah" (VT p. 62).

A classic example of the confusion of Armenian and Georgian titles is the curious and regrettably unique passage in SO p. 100 which mentions the dignitaries summoned by atabek Iwane (ca. 1224) to participate in a judicial decision: "...[Iwane] ordered his grantees to sit and examine the matter: Bubak and the marcuan [proper name or title?], Iwane the dpel and the memnašiel [title, or proper name Memna Jaqeli?], the great clawnditel (bishop) who had come from the kingdom, the ciram clawr (abbot) of Varji and the abbot of Panjahank', the great mamt'avar (patriarch) of Garste, the Gageck'ik', and the Macnaberdec'ik' and in addition, many other didebuls: the gadi of Dwin and the one called the šex of Surmari. [Among the examiners were also] the great bishop of Ani, the bishop of Bjni, and the bishop of Harbat". See L. Melik set'-Bek', "A Testimony about the Structure and Procedure of the Supreme Court in Zak'arid Armenia", Telekagir #3-4 (1945) pp. 75-79 (in Arm.).

- 1232/33 Col. Yov. Yiš., pp. 886-87: "Now this Bible... was requested by... the honorable prince of princes

Patron Xawfas, son of Amir Sargis, who was the brother of the mother of the Caesars of Armenia, Georgia, and all Abxazia...the great Zak'are and Iwane...before whom he was nourished and grew up...After great Zak'are's untimely passing to Christ--which plunged the land of Armenia into darkness--his well-favored descendant...the mandatort'axuc'es of the great kingdom, Sahnšah, succeeded to the throne of his father's kingdom...May Jesug Christ keep him in peace...and also keep his son Zak'are 'born into the crown'(t'agacin)...The same loyalty was shown by the very honorable prince of princes Xawfas educating and nourishing him with all piety and devoutness as he had been educated by his forbears--from whom as recompense for his loyal service, he received a great honor [of the office] of msaxurt'axuc'es in Georgian which translates into our [Armenian] language as 'chief and commander of all the rulers and chiefs of the royal house of his lord' (glux iṣxec'ol ew bramanatar amenayn iṣxec'olac'ew glxawor-ac tan t'agaworut ean teafn iwroy)".

## APPENDIX B

Aspects of Centrifugality within and among Certain 13-14th Century Naxarardoms

The 13th and 14th centuries were characterized by conflicts within and among certain Caucasian naxarardoms. In some cases these conflicts pertained to families (e.g., the Georgian Bagratids, the Zak'arean/Mxargrcelis, the Kaxaberijes of Rača, the Orbelian/Orbelis, the Arceruni/Mahkanaberdelis, the Jaqelis), in other cases, to the "naxarardoms" of the Church(es). The conflict within the Georgian royal family was extremely serious and must be mentioned not only as an example of centrifugality at the very pinnacle of authority in Christian Caucasasia, but also because of its divisive ramifications. On his deathbed, king Giorgi Laša Bagratuni (d. 1223) was promised by his sister Rusudan that Giorgi's child son David Lašaan would receive the throne on his maturity. Rusudan (d. ca. 1245) then became "king" of Georgia. Rather than honoring the pledge made to her late brother, Rusudan instead banished and imprisoned David Lašaan and enthroned her own son (also named David). While co-optation of the heir hardly was a new feature in Georgia, its almost inevitable result was the polarization of the nobility into two hostile camps. Eventually the authority of the "usurper" David Rusudanean was challenged by the matured embittered David Lašaan. Between 1250 and 1258, Georgia thus had two kings simultaneously. The line of David Lašaan occupied the throne in Tiflis until 1289, but from

1291 to 1318 a system of collegial sovereignty existed in Georgia whereby Lašaan kings were forced to share the realm with co-kings--their very sons, or candidates from the rival line of David Rusudanean<sup>1</sup>.

Hostile relations among prominent families had at their base disputes over land. From the order of Kirakos Ganjakec'i's narration, one might (incorrectly) assume that the amirspasalar Awag Zak'arean was the first Armenian prince to surrender to the Mongols (1236) and consequently his holdings were not disturbed by the conquerors<sup>2</sup>. However, Kirakos' junior contemporary, Step'annos Orbelean, placed the submission of Elikum Orbelean before that of Awag<sup>3</sup>, and the point is revealing and crucial. For the Armenian Orbeleans, prior to the

---

<sup>1</sup> C. Toumanoff, "The Fifteenth Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia", Traditio VII (1949-51) pp. 204-5, 210.

<sup>2</sup> KG pp. 255-56.

<sup>3</sup> SO pp. 149-50: "...Taking [Elikum] as a guide [the Mongols' commander Aslan-novin] went as far as Ani, subduing everyone. He took Vayoc' Jor and Elegis as far as Ereror village which stands opposite Gafni, and gave it all to Elikum, saying: 'That which was taken by the sword and that which was bought with gold are equally the patrimony of man. Now these districts which I have taken with my sword shall be yours as patrimony and the patrimony of your line. Do you now faithfully look upon us and serve the Great Khan who sent us here'. And Elikum with great heartfelt thanks served them. From that day forth it was confirmed that those [lands] would be the patrimony of the Orbelean tun (House) and line. Now other commanders subordinated other lands and brought out of Kayen fortress, Awag. They took the

invasions, had been clients of the Iwanē-Awagids, yet from Step'annos' account it appears that the Orbēleans (with Mongol approval) had expanded their holdings at Awagid expense, at the time of the conquest itself. Enmity over the Orbēlan expansion may have accounted for Elikum's death, as Step'annos suggested<sup>1</sup>, and enmity marked Zak'arid-Orbēlean relations for some decades to follow. Elikum was succeeded by his polyglot brother Smbat.

...But after Elikum['s death] the tun(House) of Awag treated the Orbelean tun with great jealousy, and enmity especially Awag's wife. They wanted to disperse and persecute the, or to destroy the surviving children, Smbat and his brothers. They [the Awagids] seized their patrimony while [the Orbēleans] wandered about in concealment, here and there until the compassionate love of the Creator willed to restore and strengthen the Orbelean tun through Smbat... .2.

The significance of the underlined "especially Awag's wife" appears to have escaped modern scholars. Curiously, it appears that the line of Gonc'a, daughter of the duke Kaxaberi of Rač, descended from a Georgian branch of the Orbēleans<sup>3</sup>. Consequently, Gonc'a's enmity toward

---

kingdom of Georgia by force, and absolutely ruled everywhere" (SO pp. 149-50).

1

SO p. 150 suggests that Elikum was murdered by physicians at the command of Awag.

2

SO p. 151.

3

Toumanoff, Studies, p. 211 n. 238.

Smbat may have had elements of an intra-family feud. It is interesting too (and similarly unremarked by scholars) that the Awagid-Orbēlean land dispute resulting from the Mongol conquest has been carried over into the sources more than once, and in more than one way. For example, in relating one and the same story--how Smbat Orbēlean aided a fugitive monarch--Step'annos Orbēlean mentions the incident as occurring on Smbat's land, whereas the History of K'art'li describes the same territory as "the land of atabek Awag"<sup>1</sup>.

The importance and severity of the [Kaxiberije]-Awagid--Orbēlean feud led Smbat to the Far East on two occasions, for protection and confirmation of "his lands". The first visit(ca. 1252) resulted in Smbat's vindication<sup>2</sup>. But the

---

<sup>1</sup> SO pp. 152-53; KC p. 228; Mur. p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> SO p. 157: "They gave him a golden p'aviza which is a tablet bearing the names of God and of the king, their greatest honor. They also drew up a yarligh (earflex) which we call sigel--a command--and gave him all that Aslan had taken by the sword and Orotn with its lands...and the gortress of Borotn with its provisions, as the blood--price for the murder of his father Liparit. Furthermore they removed Smbat['s name] from the dawt'ars of the Georgians and others. This was the second confirmation of their patrimony, for the first [time] it was taken by th sword, when [Smbat] was a servant, by the agency of Aslan--noyin; while the second time [it was received] as a gift from the Khan..."

Awagids were unwilling to accept this verdict, and plotted to destroy Smbat:

Now while these [events] were so [unfolding] that wicked Satan started stirring up envy and inciting the tun of Awag and the Georgian grandees [against Smbat]. Awag had died in the year 1250/51 (699 A.E.). His wife had a daughter named Xoşak', and ruled all of his principedom. They assembled in Tiflis near Arghun, for the great Khan had designated him vezler and paslaz (overseer) over all the lands, i.e., commander of all and ruler of the royal taxes and the great diwan. [It was he] who made a census of all the lands in 1254/55 (703 A.E.). With numerous bribes they requested Smbat's destruction and that he not be able to hereditarily transmit his country. Arghun did not dare accede to this request, but he did take away from Smbat many places, and severely oppressed the remainder. 1.

Smbat made a second journey to the Far East ca. 1257, and had his rights reconfirmed<sup>2</sup>. Meanwhile Gonc'a Kaxiberije-Awagean had married the Georgian king, David Lašaeen.

1

SO p. 159: "Isk minč iys avspēs linēr, ada bariateac'n satanay sksaw naxani Ārkanel, ew grērel ztunn Awagin ew zmecamecan Vrac. ew zī Awagn vaxcaneal, er i 699 t uin ew kin nora Gonc' avn uner dustr me Xoşak' anun. ew is-xer amenavn isxanut ean nora. yasn orov zołovec an i Tr is at Arġunn or er vazir ew pasta (tesuĉ) kargeal i mec ĩanen i veray amenavn asxarhis, avsink n pramanatar amenec un ew isxec oĉ ark uni ĥarkac n ew mec diwanin, or arar asxarhagir zasxarhs amenavn y703 t uakanin: Ew bazum kasafok xndrein korusanel zSmpat ew oĉ ģafang-ec uĉ anel zerkir nora, zor ew oĉ ĥamariaker Arġunn, ayl aġin i Smbatay bazum teġis. ew zmnac'ealsn keġek'-ein pastkapes".

2

SO p. 161.



The birth of their son Demitre created a Bagratid-Kaxaber-ije-Awagean link. The struggle of families was by no means over, however:

...Now Smbat planned, with the other princes to become the "adopted father" of Awag's tun; by order of Hülegü-Khan they had Gonc'a drowned in the sea, and he, Smbat, ruled over all of Awag's principedom. He gave Awag's daughter Xoşak in marriage to the great sahipdiwan Xoja [brother of the historian Juvayni]...This occurred in 1269/70 (718 A.E.). 1.

According to Step'annos, the Georgian monarch David Lašaeen and Smbat were on the best of terms: "King David so loved Smbat that he considered him his equal, and placed the little boy Demitre in his hands, giving his son to him"<sup>2</sup>. Once again the enmity of families has left

1

SO p. 165: "Isk Smbatav hayragir leal tann Awagin' xorhi end ayl isxanac n. ew tan spananel i covamili zGonc ayn, hramanaw Hulawu lanin. ew ink n isxer amen-ayn isxanut eanc Awagin. Ew tay zdustr nora zXosak n i knut iwn mec Xo javin sahip diwanin...ew er ays y718 t uin". KC p. 251; Mur. p. 123: "Now Awag's former wife, the queen Gonc'a, was killed when located among the Tatars, as they say; and it was at the urging of her daughter Xoşak, wife of the sahibdivan khoja Shams--ad Din that she was killed".

2

SO p. 168.

its imprint in the literary sources, creating a contradiction. According to the History of K'art'li, it was to Sadun Arcruni, not to his rival Smbat, that Xořak' and care for the Awagid holdings were entrusted<sup>1</sup>. Nor does the same work dwell on the close relations between the king and Smbat<sup>2</sup>.

Allegedly Smbat extracted a concession from king David. He convinced the king to destroy a document relating to the time of the expulsion of the Orbēlis from Georgia (because of their involvement in the abortive rebellion of 1176/77). Whether the Armenian Orbēleans were able to reclaim the old family possessions in Georgia is unclear from the sources, though Smbat's "exceeding delight" at

---

1

KC p. 238; Mur. p. 110: "At that time, Awag was dead, having left no male heir, but only a daughter named Xořak'. In tears the king went to Bjni. He saw Awag's fair wife, Gonc'a, the daughter of Kaxaberije, duke (erist'av) of Rač. He fell in love with her and after a short while, married her and made her queen. He brought her to his kingdom. As for Awag's daughter, he left her in her patrimonial holdings and entrusted her to Sadun Mahkanaberdeli".

2

KC p. 237; Mur. p. 109-110: "The fact that Gonc'a had become queen was displeasing to the nestumre Jik'uri, since they were enemies. So on the advice of Smbat Orbēli [word] was spread about that Jik'uri had sent someone to Arghun to reveal to Hūlegū-Khan the [size of the] king's wealth, and his intention to rebel".

the king's action, reminiscent of Elikum's "heartfelt thanks" to Aslan noyin strongly suggests that some partial restitution was made to the Orbēleans<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>

SO pp. 168-69: "Then the king called Smbat to Tiflis and wanted to show his gratitude to him through very great gifts. He asked Smbat: 'What great gifts shall I bestow upon you? For whatever in my kingdom you wish, whatever you find agreeable, I shall give you unsparingly'. Smbat arose and prostrated himself: 'Oh king, whatever we have is/was [given by] you and your forbears. This much is enough for us; but there is one thing I request from you'. The king responded: 'I swear that I shall give you whatever you ask for'. Smbat said: 'Then obliterate that wicked memory of us, through which your forbear, [ing] Georgi slandered my ancestors. For he had written [a document] with curses, such that we not be allowed into our patrimony, and he had it placed in his treasury. Give that [document] to me'. The king was astonished and despised his father for removing from his tun such powerful and capable men. And he ordered his attendants to search for and bring that document (girk: "writing, letter, book"). They went, located it, and quickly brought it. The king took it in his hand and stood up, saying: 'Behold, Smbat, take the document you requested'. Smbat arose, prostrated himself, and replied: 'Oh king, who so forgave the past, show me [yet another] kindness. That book was written by a king's hand; it must be destroyed by a king's hand. Order that a fire be kindled before yourself, and throw that book into the flames with your own hand'. At once the king commanded that a fire be struck up. He pulled out his sword, tore out the pages, and threw them into the fire. Whereupon Smbat was exceedingly delighted and thanked him. After this, the king gave him many other magnificent gifts and robes of honor and further distinguished him and sent him home. In this manner did Smbat remove the stigma attached to his ancestors, and left a good reputation for those succeeding [him]".

According to Step'annos, the preeminence of Orbēleans in Caucasian affairs continued after Smbat "passed from this world in a chariot of angels"--probably murdered while in Tabrīz (1274)<sup>1</sup>. Smbat's heir, his younger brother Tarsayiġ supposedly enthroned Demitre "with great effort" as king of Georgia<sup>2</sup>. But the History of K'art'li describes matters differently. Sadun Arcruni's great influence is noted, while Tarsayiġ Orbēlean is not even mentioned:

During this period Sadun Mahkanaberdeli had become stronger than all his contemporary princes, since Abaqa liked him. And [Sadun] started to be caretaker of all Georgia's affairs, because [the king] had entrusted [to his care] lord atabek Awag's daughter, while Koġak' had given him the eġibdom.

Then all the gidebuls of Georgia assembled and took the royal Demitre to the Horde. They went to Sahnŝah's son, Iwane, the mandat'urt'--uxuc'es, and he too went to the Horde where they saw to it that Demitre received the reign... [Abaqa-Khan] gave the entire kingdom to him, excepting [the lands of] Sargis Jaqeli. He sent him back to Sadun whom king Demitre made atabek.. 3.

---

<sup>1</sup> SO p. 166.

<sup>2</sup> SO p. 171: "bazum ĵaniw".

<sup>3</sup> KC pp. 269-70; Mur. p. 150.

According to the History of K'art'li, Sadun was made atabek by the new Georgian monarch, and upon his death (d. 1281/82) his son Xut'lubula Arcruni received Sadun's property and the office of spaspeti<sup>1</sup>. Step'annos Orbēlean wrote the following:

...[Arghun-Khān] liked king Demitre greatly. He gave Demitre the entire land of Armenia, the tun (House) of Awag and the tun of Sahnšah and of the Gagec'ik' and the sons of atabek Sadun...

...Then Demitre returned [to the Caucasus] with great joy and all the azats and grandees of Georgia and Armenia with him. When he reached Sarur, Tarsayiĉ came before him and magnified the king with great honor and royal gifts. [Demitre] took him to his Awagean country, Ayarat, and greatly entreating him, forced him to be atabek over his entire lordship, from Tiflis to Ani and Kars. He also entrusted Tarsayiĉ with his young sons, Dawit' and Manuel whom he raised and kept. Thereafter Tarsayiĉ held the atabekate of the land of Armenia and did many things to lighten[the lot of] the harassed Armenian people... 2.

King Demitre "sent his little son David to the house of atabek Awag so that he would grow up there and have a

1 KC p. 281; Mur. p. 150.

2 According to the History of K'art'li, the property of atabek Awag, before being entrusted to king Demitre "belonged to the sahipdiwan", i.e., to Shams ad-Din Juvaini (KC p. 285; Mur. p. 153). SO pp. 172-73: "Ew er end nora t'agaworn Demetre, zor sireac' Artunn, ew et nma zamenayn asxarhis Hayoc' ztunn Awagean ew ztunn Sahansahean ew Gagec' in ew zordisn Sadun at abekin... Apa darjaw Demetre mecaw xndut eamb ew amenayn azatok', ew mecameck' Vrac ew Hayoc' end nma. Ew ekeal i Sarur, gnac nma end afaj Tarsayiĉn mecamec patuov, ew ark unakan ancaviwk' mecareac' zt agaworn. Ew na afeal taraw end iwr zna verkirn Awagean vAyarat, ew bazum i axanianok' btnaz-boseac' zna, ew ed At abek iveray amenayn terut san iwroy minčew i Tp'is ew vAni ew i Kars. Ew ed i lers nora ztlaven iwr zDawit' ew zManueln anuc anel znosa ew pahel, Ew vavymhete uner Tarsayiĉn zat abekut' iwn asxarhis Hayoc', ew bazum diwrut iwn ew olormut iwn afner neleal azgis Hayoc'..."

share in the property of the royal line"<sup>1</sup>. The Orbēleans are not mentioned here. The sources themselves are in conflict over who was the more important naxarar in this period, but what is important here is the evidence of conflict among the families. Indeed, within the Orbēlean family itself quarrels arose among the children of Tarsayiĉ after his death (1290)<sup>2</sup>.

Conflicts among the secular lordly families were paralleled by conflicts among the clerical nobility. As the history of the Armenian Church in this period has been studied in elaborate detail in Ormanian's Azgapatum, here we shall note only some of the major divisions which led to unlimited conflict and rivalry. First, there were religious differences within the two branches of the Zak'arid family itself. Though Zak'arē remained true to Armenian Monophysitism, his brother Iwanē "converted" to Georgian Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. Nor was Iwanē an exceptional case. Many Armenians,

---

1 KC p. 285; Mur. p.153.

2 SO pp. 177-78: "...But then his sons commenced arguing over their father's lordships and principedom. They went to the royal court and stood before the ruler Arghun-Khan and familiarized him with their debate. Arghun called forth the senior son, Elikum, appointed him to his father's place and set him as prince over all. However, although Elikum ruled all of his father's patrimonies and principedom, nonetheless he did not want to deprive his brothers. So he divided the entire inheritance with the advice of the bishops, vardapets and azats. He gave a suitable portion to his brother's son, Liparit...".

especially those living and working in Georgia or in the Armeno-Georgian borderlands had come under the influence of Chalcedonianism. These Armenian Chalcedonians performed the Greek rite in the Armenian language. The sources contain frequent allusions to rancor and enmity between Armenian Monophysites and Armenian Chalcedonians<sup>1</sup>. The disputes occasionally took the form of land disputes between monasteries<sup>2</sup>.

Second, Roman Catholicism began to have an impact on Armenian religious affairs. In the 13th century, for complicated reasons, the Cilician Armenian monarchy and kat'olikosate and certain circles in Greater Armenia began encouraging the idea of religious union with Rome<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> VA p. 143; Zak'arē and Iwanē attempted to forcibly unite the Armenian Monophysite and the Georgian Chalcedonian Churches, unsuccessfully (KG pp. 166-67; the Annals of Bishop Step'annos, MC vol. 1 p. 38). The center of Georgian Chalcedonianism in northern Armenia was the monastery of Pinjahank', on which see P.M. Muradyan, "Vrac'eren arjanagrut'yunner Hayastanum: Pinjahank'" [Georgian inscriptions in Armenia: Pinjahank'] "Traber #1 (1973) pp. 39-57, as well as the same author's first article, "Georgian inscriptions in Armenia" describing the inscriptions at Hnevank', Sanahin, and Halbat, Telekagir #3 (1966) pp. 30-47.

<sup>2</sup> KG p. 222.

<sup>3</sup> G. Petrowicz, "Miabanol elbayrnera ew Hay ekelec'in [The Uniators and the Armenian Church]", HA (1969) pp. 361-62.

In 1316 at the Council of Adana, union was made<sup>1</sup>. But although a number of vardapets and bishops agreed to union, others rejected Latinophile policies outright<sup>2</sup>. During the tenure as kat'olikos of Yakob Ssec'i (1327--41, 1355-59), Sis and Ējmiacin broke over the issue<sup>3</sup>. But by that time the Dominicans had won over to Catholicism the influential Yovhannēs K'fneš'i of southern Siwnik', who began attracting to Catholicism his former fellow classmates<sup>4</sup>. The fight against the Armenian Catholics of K'fna preoccupied the Armenian Church leadership for much of the 14th century. During the reign of Yakob Ssec'i, matters had deteriorated to the point that the Cilician kat'olikos supported K'fna's efforts against Ējmiacin<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Petrowicz pp. 363-64.

<sup>2</sup> As Petrowicz notes, the signatures of those favoring unity, appearing on the protocols of the Council of Adana, indicate support from numerous parts of Armenia: (all bishops) Vardan of Ani, Yovhannes Maranduneanc', Yovhannēs of Taron, Markos of Kars, Yakob of Salmast, Grigor of Maraš, Nerses of Kamax, Awetik' of Np'rkert, Vardan of Sasun, P'ilippos of Xofjean, Step'annos of Colonean (HA p. 367).

<sup>3</sup> Petrowicz pp. 364-65.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. pp. 367-68.

<sup>5</sup> ibid. pp. 466-67.



A third source of conflict came from the very existence of the kat'olikosate (or anti-kat'olikosate) of Ałt'amar. The kat'olikosate and its jurisdiction were denounced and "nullified" by the kat'olikosate of Sis in the early 12th century, but this did not put an end to Ałt'amar's independent development<sup>1</sup>. Kat'olikos Grigor Anawarzec'i (1293-1307) attempted, unsuccessfully, to bring Ałt'amar into allegiance with Sis and Ėjmiacin<sup>2</sup>. In 1408/9 the noted cleric and scholar Grigor Tat'ewac'i removed his diocese of K'aĵberunik' from communion with Ałt'amar, but the general anathema imposed on the kat'olikoi of Ałt'amar remained in effect until 1441<sup>3</sup>. The kat'olikosate of Ałt'amar continued its existence until 1895<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Akinean, "Ałt'amar" , HA (1916) pp. 141-42, (1917/18) p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> ibid. (1916) p. 142.

<sup>3</sup> ibid. pp. 144-45.

<sup>4</sup> ibid. p. 148. Yet another special "center" of the Church was the district of Siwnik' in eastern Armenia, an area traditionally known for its separatist tendencies. The political independence of Siwnik' in this period was paralleled by jurisdictional independence in religious matters. Thus the historian Step'annos Orbelean was ordained in Cilicia in 1287/88, "metropolitan of the great see of Siwnik'", above all the other bishops here and there, some in Vayoc' Jor and some in Tat'ew" (SO p. 174). To my knowledge, Step'annos was the first cleric in Armenia to be styled metropolitan, a new term perhaps to match Siwnik''s unique position (VT p. 137, also CIA v. II p. 78). In any case the erudite Step'annos appears to have maintained good relations with Sis and with the clerical nobility of Greater Armenia. It is known, for example, that Step'annos was a close friend of kat'olikos Zak'aria I of Ałt'amar (1296--1336) and requested from him a copy of T'ovma Arcruni's History of the Arcrunid House (10th cent.)(TA p. 319]. For

Given the numerous sources of conflict, within and among families, and within and among religious institutions, the foreign rulers of Armenia in the 13-14th centuries did not have great difficulty keeping the naxarars divided--it was the natural state of affairs.

---

the most part, however, relations among the various Armenian Christian groups--just as relations among the important secular naxarardoms--were characterized by bitter conflict and rivalry.

## APPENDIX C

Notes on the Relations between the Mongols and the  
Armenian Church in the 13th Century

1. Philo-Christianity and Taxation of the Church

During the 13th century, the presence of numerous Christian Mongols in the Mongol court and army had many different ramifications. General statements to the effect that the Mongols were philo-Christian or that the Church and its hierarchy were not taxed during the domination are misleadingly inaccurate. While specific Mongols were philo-Christian, and though churches under the jurisdiction of certain naxarar families were not always taxed, the situation changed from ruler to ruler.

The earliest information on relations between the Mongols and the Armenian Church is found in Kirakos Ganjakec'i's History and relates to the first appearance of the Mongols in the Caucasus, ca. 1220/21:

...False information came concerning them to the effect that they were mages and/or of the Christian faith--wonder-words--and that they had come to avenge the Christians from the tyranny of the Tačiks. And it was said that they had with them a portable tent-church and a miracle-working cross and that they would bring and throw an ephah of barley before this cross and all the soldiers would take from it, and give it to their horses and the supply would not be exhausted...Such false rumors filled the land. Therefore the inhabitants of the country did not fortify themselves

in, to the point that one lay presbyter, taking his people, even went before [the Tatars] carrying [in procession] hooded crosses. The enemy put them to the sword, one and all. 1.

The Mongols' motives in this instance, during their reconnaissance mission of 1220/21 simply may have been to terrorize the population. However it is not impossible that the unfortunate Christian welcoming party was mistaken for a band of secular princes. According to Kirakos Ganjakec<sup>1</sup>, when in 1236 the Mongols returned to the Caucasus and in subduing the region captured the great cleric and scholar Vanakan vardapet, they thought that he was a secular prince and pressed him for information about fortresses and the whereabouts of the Armenian lords<sup>2</sup>. In any case, in 1236 the Mongols did not exterminate the intellectuals who had fallen into their hands. Vanakan,

---

1 KG p. 202: "Ew hambaw stut'ean gayr znoc'anē, t'ē mogk' en ew k\_ristoneayk' hawatov, ew nsanagorck', ew ekeal en i yrezxndrut iwn k\_ristoneic', or i bfnut enen tačkac'. Ew aseın, t'ē unin ekelec i vraneay ew xač sk ančelagorc ew bereal kapič mē gari arkanen atai xačın, ew amenavn zork'n atēal i nmane tanin tan erivanac' iwreanc', ew nč pakasi. avl ibrew spatın amenek ean i tanelov, novncap' kapič anden mnay... Ew ayaspisi hambaw stut'ean ic aw vaaxarha. Vaañ aysorik nč amrac an bnakič asxarhin, mičew erēc mi asxarhakan atēal zəlovurd iwr, ew xačiwk vatelovk, ent ac aw end atai noc a. Ew noc a sur i veray edeal kotorec in znosa at basarak...".

2 KG p. 246.

his student Kirakos, and many other clerics were forced to serve the Mongols as secretaries, "writing and reading letters"<sup>1</sup>.

A definite improvement in conditions for Christians of the Mongol Middle East was achieved by the Syrian doctor of the Church, Rabban in 1241/42<sup>2</sup>. Thanks to

1  
KG p. 249: "Apa afin ew zis synkerac' imoc' zkni iwreanc'  
1 pets dprut ean grei t uit ew ent' efnul...".

2  
KG pp. 276-77: "...He was known as the 'father of the Khan', since in Syriac rabān means vardapet, while in Mongolian at'a means father. As soon as he heard about the merciless killing of the Christians occasioned by the Tatar troops, he approached the Khan and beseeched him for a letter to give the Tatar troops, commanding them not to kill innocent people the way they were doing, people who had not warred against them, but instead [the Mongols should] let them alone so that they might serve the king. With great pomp the Khan sent Raban himself to his commanders with a written order that all obey his command.

"When Raban arrived, many things turned propitious for the Christians and the killings and captures ceased. He likewise built churches in Tačik cities where previously no one dared utter the name of Christ--even in Tabriz and the city of Naxčawan which were yet more inimical to the Christians, so much so that Christians [dwelling there] did not dare appear or walk abroad openly, to say nothing of constructing a church or erecting a cross. Yet Raban erected cross and church, and the sounding-board was heard day and night. Christians openly took their dead for burial, carrying [in the procession] hooded crosses, gospels, and worshipping after the Christian custom. Those opposing them were put to death. No one dared come out against [Raban's] order. On the contrary, the Tatar army revered him like their king, and without Raban, they neither planned nor did anything...And those merchants who had his tamgha that is to say, insignia, boldly circulated throughout the lands and no one dared approach those who mentioned Raban's name. Instead all the Tatar commanders gave him gifts from their booty".

Raban's efforts, Nersēs, kat'olikos of Caucasian Albania was taken to Chormaghun's wife, Altana:

...They gave [Nersēs] gifts and an al-tamgha, so that no one would harass him, [and] they gave him a Mo'al Tatar guide who took him throughout his dioceses in Albania. For a long while neither [Nersēs] nor his predecessors had dared to circulate throughout the dioceses due to the blood-thirsty and bestial nation of Tačika. Now [Nersēs] passed throughout his dioceses, returning peacefully to his residence in Xamši monastery... 1.

In 1247/48, the kat'olikos Kostandin of Cilicia sent to Greater Armenia gifts and money for the embellishment of the monastery of St. T'adeōs, which was then elevated to a diocese. This renovation work was entrusted to a vardapet Yovsēp' and was expedited by the Mongols:

And Yovsēp' went to a Tatar commander named Angurak noyin whose summer quarters were close by the tomb of the blessed apostle T'adeos. And on his command, Yovsep' blessed the church and held the pre-consecration ceremony, built a monastery and assembled many clerics in it.

The Tatar man enlarged the roads on all sides [so that] all pilgrims could come amongst his troops fearlessly. He commanded strictly that no one wishing to come be harassed, and he humbled himself to them with love. And many of them came and baptized their sons and daughters, and many who

1

KG pp. 291-92: "...Etun nma pargews ew ēltamlays, zi mi' ok' nelesc' ē zna, etun nma mo'al t'at'ar afajnord, or tareal srjeo oyc, zna yašxarhn Aluanic i vičak iwr, zi yoloj zamanakk ein, or oč na ew oč ork yafa] k'an zna, oč isxein srjil end vičakeals iwrēanc, yašags ariwnarbu ew gazanabaroy azgin tačkak', is nora srjeal end vičak-ealsn darjaw andren xalatut, eamb i teai iwr, i vansn Xamši".

were possessed by devils and were sick became healed, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ was glorified. 1.

To my knowledge, the implications of certain statements in the sources concerning the tax status of the Armenian churches have not been thoroughly understood. According to Step'annos Orbēlean, prior to Smbat Orbēlean's visit to the Far East in 1252/53, the churches of Orbēlean Siwnik' were being taxed "bitterly"<sup>2</sup>. In Mōnge-Khān's

---

1

KG pp. 311-12: "Ew Yovsep'ay ert'eal af zōraglux mi T'at arin, orum anun er Anggurak-nuin, oroy i jawank n iwr yawursn amaraynov hup er i gerezman surb afak'elovn T'adeosi, ew nora hramanaw srbeal sekelec in ew nawakatis katareal sineac zvanen ew zoloveac i na kronawors bazums.  
Ew avr T'at ar endarjakeac, zcanaparhs yamenayn koimanc anerkiw gal uxtakanac n end mel zorac nora, patuer hramani tueal sastkut eamb mi zok, zzuel ew netel, or kamic in gal, ew ink n sirov xonarher af nosa. Ew bazumk i noc unc Gavin ew mkrtein zusters ew zdusters iwreanc.  
ew bazum aysahark ew hiwandk bzskain. ew p afawor liner anun tearn meroy Yisusi K'ristosi".

2

SO p. 154.

presence, Smbat complained about the harassment of the churches<sup>1</sup>, and received from Möngke "a decree freeing all the churches of Armenia and the priests", a statement repeated twice<sup>2</sup>. With encouragement from Baiju's wife, Smbat rennovated Siwnik's religious seat Tat'ew (then in a dilapidated condition)<sup>3</sup>. Kirakos and the History of K'art'li very clearly state that as a result of emir Arghun's census of 1255, neither Church nor clergy was to be taxed<sup>4</sup>. However, in 1257 when Hasan Jalal visited Batu-Khān in the North, he pointed out that Nersēs, kat'olikos of Albania still was being harassed. He was given a written order that such harassment should stop<sup>5</sup>.

---

1  
SO p. 155.

2  
SO p. 157: "Ew hraman ēať azatel samenayn ekelec'is Hayoc' ew zk'ahanays"; SO p. 158: "Ew azateac zekelec'is ew zk'ahanays ziwroy isxanut'eann ew amenayn asxarhis Hayoc'."

3  
SO p. 158.

4  
KG p. 363; "This [emir] Arghun designated what was proper [for tax collection] in all four Khanates, for he was a just man. But as for monks, friars, and Church foundations, he did not place them under taxation, nor the balan [tax] either. The same went for sheikhs and dervishes. He freed [from taxation] all those Believers called the Servants of God" (KC p. 235; Mur. p. 108).

5  
KG p. 359: "...[Hasan] also received a document guarenteeing freedom for lord Nersēs, kat'olikos of Albania, for all his properties and goods, that he be free and untaxed and allowed to travel freely everywhere in the dioceses under his authority, and that no one disobey what he said".



The fact that Hasan, subsequently "being harassed by tax-collectors and by [emir] Arghun"<sup>1</sup> was obliged to visit the Far East to complain, demonstrates the crucial point, and is equally valid for the secular Hasan and the clerical Nersēs. It was not enough simply to have written patents of authority or protection. The local Mongol noyins did not always implement them.

In the late 1270's according to the History of K'art'li, the twelve retreats of Garesja, Georgia were taxed by the Mongols--even though under the administration of so loyal a Mongol supporter as Sadun Arcruni/Mahkanaberdeli<sup>2</sup>. In the early 1280's (and presumably before), more than 150 Armenian monasteries within the Georgian state were being taxed<sup>3</sup>. Consequently we must conclude that even before the Islamization of the Mongols, many Armenian churches were taxed.

---

<sup>1</sup> KG p. 359: "Neleal i harkapahanjac'n ew yArġunēn".

<sup>2</sup> KC p. 272; Mur. p. 142.

<sup>3</sup> SO p. 173: "Thereafter Tarsayiġ [Orbēlean] held the atabekate of the land of Armenia, and did many things to lighten[the lot of] the harassed Armenian people. Going to Tiflis he had brought forth the royal diwan and read all the names of the Armenian monasteries, and such remained in the diwan as taxable (i nerġ'oy harkī). So he had fetched the senior ciknawpar of the archives and changed the dawt'ar. He removed the names of more than 150 monasteries. [from the tax-register] and burned the old [register] in the fire. Thus did he free all the churches".

## 2. Armenian Clerical Presence at the Courts of the Khāns

William of Rubruck and Het'um the Historian provide valuable information regarding Armenian clerics in Asia and about Armenian Christian influence on the Khāns. Rubruck who travelled to the Far East during 1253-55 found Armenian priests at virtually all the major stopping places. At the very start of his trip, in Constantinople he met and conversed with Armenian merchants and resident clerics<sup>1</sup>. At Sarai on the Volga river, the capital of the Northern Tatars, he encountered at the court of Sartakh-Khān (Batu's son) "Armenian priests who knew Turkish and Arabic" and were employed as translators in addition to performing religious duties<sup>2</sup>. Armenian priests were serving as translators in Qara Qorum, Mongolia also as William subsequently discovered<sup>3</sup>.

In Qara Qorum, Rubruck came upon a small Armenian chapel. Its colorful attendant was the "monk" Sargis. This

---

<sup>1</sup> WR p. xxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> WR p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> WR pp. 166, 205.

impostor claimed that:

...he had been a hermit in the country of Jerusalem, and that God had appeared to him three times, enjoining on him to go to the Prince of the Tartars. But as he neglected going, God threatened him the third time, striking him down to the ground, and saying that he should die if he did not go; and that he should say to Möngke--Khan that if he would become a Christian, all the world would come under his rule, and that the great Pope would obey him... 1.

Sargis indeed was an Armenian, "swarthy and lank"<sup>2</sup>, but not a priest; and, if a Christian, of a rather shamanistic sort<sup>3</sup>:

...but he lied, for he had taken no [religious] orders, and did not know a single letter, but was a cloth weaver, as I found out in his own country, which I went through on my way back. 4.

Although William does not mention other Armenian clerics by names, he does allude to their presence. Thus, worried

---

<sup>1</sup> WR p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> WR p. 168.

<sup>3</sup> WR pp. 193-96, 203-205, 207, 211, 218-19.

<sup>4</sup> WR p. 193.

that the Pope's letters he was carrying may have been tampered with, he wrote:

...I feared that as those who had interpreted your letters were Armenians from Greater Armenia--great haters of the Saracens --they had perhaps through hatred and for the discomfiture of the Saracens, gratuitously translated as had suited their fancy. 1.

Furthermore, Rubruck's comment that Armenian Easter was celebrated in Qara Qorum with a large clerical procession to the Khān's residence, only makes sense if there were a sizeable number of Armenian clerics present<sup>2</sup>.

While in Qara Qorum, William encountered an unnamed Armenian lordly petitioner to Mōngke-Khān:

A certain Armenian who had come with the monk had brought this said cross from Jerusalem, as he said, and it was of silver, weighing perhaps four marks, and had four gems in the angles and one in the center; and it did not have the image of the Savior, for the Armenians and Nestorians are ashamed to show the Christ fixed to the Cross. And they had presented it to Mōngke-Khān, and Mōngke asked him what he wanted. Then he said he was the son of an Armenian priest, whose church had been destroyed by the Saracens, and he asked his help to restore this church. Then [Mōngke] asked him with how much it could be rebuilt, and he said two hundred iascot--that is two thousand marks. And he ordered that he should be given letters to him who receives the tribute in Persia and Greater Armenia, to pay him this sum of silver. 3.

---

1  
WR p. 166.

2  
WR p. 187.

3  
WR p.191.

In my opinion, the lord mentioned above probably was Smbat Orbelean, whose first trip to the Far East took place while Whilliam was in Qara Qorum.

Het'um the Historian's History provides an account of Armenian Christian influence in the courts of various Mongol Khāns. Evidently, some of his information is fanciful or perhaps even wishful thinking. However, the unmistakable import of his narration is that Armenian Christians enjoyed considerable influence with different Khāns. Supposedly, when king Het'um of Cilicia visited Möngke-Khān in the early 1250's:

...First he urged the Khān to convert to Christianity and to accept baptism together with his people; second, that eternal peace and friendship be established between Christians and Tatars; third, that it be possible to construct Christian churches in all of the Tatar countries and that the Armenians be freed from taxes and other burders; fourth, that the Holy Land and the Holy Sepulcher be wrested from the Turks and given to the Christians; fifth, that the caliph in Baghdad, the head of the [Muslim] religion, be done away with...When the Tatar Khan had consulted with his princes and grandees, he replied to the king of Armenia: 'I accept your requests. I shall accept baptism and adopt the Christian religion and show concern that all my subjects do likewise... 1.

---

1

Het'um p. 45.

Chapter 24 of the History is entitled "Regarding the Baptism of Mōngke-Khān" :

Now after Mōngke had accepted the requests of the Armenian king with charitable munificence, he had himself baptised by the chancellor of the Armenian kingdom, who was a bishop. Whith him [were baptised] his house and numerous other esteemed and grand men and women. 1.

The Cilician king Kewon (like all the Cilician kings) is elevated in Het'um's account to the position of defender of the Christians. When visiting Abaqa-Khān in Iran:

...the king of Armenia beseeched him regarding freeing the Holy Land from the infidels. And Abaqa so promised, simultaneously advising the Armenian king to send emissaries to the Pope and to the orthodox kings [regarding this matter]. 2.

Thus we may conclude that an Armenian clerical presence existed at the courts of the Khāns already by the early 1250's, and probably earlier. It may have developed into a sizeable presence before the Islamization of the Mongols in the late 13-early 14th centuries, involving clerics both from Greater Armenia and Cilicia. The influence of Christian Cilician kings with the Khāns ended with Mongol Islamization.

---

1  
Het'um p. 46.

2  
Het'um p. 57.

## Bibliography

## I. Sources

AL

Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, Patmut'wn Aristakisi Lastivertc'woy [History of Aristakes Lastivertc'i], K. N. Yuzbasyan, ed. (Erevan, 1963).

Trans. : Récit des malheurs de la nation arménienne, M. Canard et H. Berbérian, trad. (Bruxelles, 1973).

Povestvovanie vardapeta Aristakēsa Lastiverttsi, K.N. Yuzbasyan, trans. (Moscow, 1968).

BH, Chronicon Syriacum

Bar Hebraeus, The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj... Bar Hebraeus, E.A.W. Budge, trans. (London, 1976) reprint of the 1932 edition.

CIA

Corpus Inscriptionum Armenicarum [Divan Hay Vimagrut'yan]

Vol. 1: H.A. Orbell, ed. (Erevan, 1966).

Vol. 2: S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1960).

Vol. 3: S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1967).

Vol. 4: S.G. Barxudaryan, ed. (Erevan, 1973).

Vol. 6: S.A. Avagyan and H.M. Janpoladyan, ed. (Erevan, 1977).

Clav.

Clavijo, Embassy to Tamerlane 1403--1406, G. Le Strange, trans. (London, 1928).

Dawit' of Ganjak

The Penitential of Dawit' of Ganjak, C.J.F. Dowsett, ed. (Louvain, 1961).

GA

Grigor Aknerc'i, History of the Nation of the Archers (the Mongols) by Grigor of Akanc'...the Armenian text edited with an English trans. by Robert P. Blake and R.N.Frye Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies #3-4(1949) pp. 269-443; printed as a separate book with the same title (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

Trans. : Istoriia Mongolov inoka Magakii [Malak'ia the Monk's History of the Mongols], K. Patkanov, trans., (St. Petersburg, 1871).

Ouvrage de Malakia-Abéggha, ou Malakia-le-Moine, in Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Georgie, M. Brosset, trans. (St. Petersburg, 1851).

Galstyan, A.G.

Armianskie istochniki o Mongolakh [Armenian Sources on the Mongols], A.G. Galstyan, trans., (Moscow, 1962).

Hayoc' nor vkanera, 1155-1843

Hayoc' nor vkanera, 1155-1843 [Armenian Neo-martyrs, ANM], Y. Manandean, Hr. Ačarean, ed. (Vałarsapat, 1903).

Het'um

Het'um the Historian, Het'um patmič T'at'arac' [Het'um, Historian of the Tatars], M. Awgerean, trans. (Venice, 1842).

Ibn al-Athir

Ibn al-Athir, "Fragments de Géographes et d'Historiens arabes et persans inédit", M. Defremery, trans. JA #13(1848), #14(1849).

Ibn Battuta

Ibn Battuta, The Travels of Ibn Battuta, H.A.R. Gibb, trans. vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1962).



Ibn Bibi

Ibn Bibi, Die Seltchukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi Munksgaard (Kopenhagen, 1959).

Trans. of passages relevant to Armenia: "Havastan Ibn Bibi Hamemat [Armenia According to Ibn Bibi] P. Ter-Polosean, trans., HA (1960):

Juanšēr

Juanšēr, Harafōt Patmut' iwn Vrac' encaveal Juanseri patmiči [Concise History of Georgia Presented by Juanser the Historian], (Venice, 1884).

Juvaini

Juvaini, The History of the World--Conqueror, J. A. Boyle, trans. vol. 1 (Manchester, 1958).

KC

K'art'lis C'xovreba [The History of K'art'li], S. Qauxçišvili, ed. vol. II (Tbilisi, 1959).

Trans. : K'art'lis C'xovreba, text and French translation by M. Brosset in Histoire de la Géorgie, depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIX siècle (St. Petersburg, 1849).

Vrac' Zamanakagrut'yun (1207-1318) [The Georgian Chronicle], P. Muradyan, trans., (Erevan, 1971).

KG

Kirakos Ganjakec'i, Patmut' iwn Hayoc' [History of Armenia], K.A. Melik-Ohanjanyan, ed. (Erevan, 1961).

Trans.: "Histoire d'Arménie par le vartabied Kirakos de Gantzac", Deux historiens arméniens, M.F. Brosset trans. (St. Petersburg, 1870).

Istoria Armenii [History of Armenia] L.A. Xanlarian, trans. (Moscow, 1976).

MC

Manr Zamanakagrut'yunner XIII-XVIIIdd.  
[Minor Chronicles of the XIII-XVIII  
Centuries], V.A. Hakobyan, ed.  
 vol. 1 (Erevan, 1951),  
 vol. 2 (Erevan, 1956).

MEd

Matthew of Edessa, Patmut'iwn  
Matt'eosi Uthayec woy [History of  
Matthew of Edessa], (Jerusalem,  
 1869).

Trans.: Bibliothèque historique  
arménienne, I, E. Dulaurier, trans.  
 (Paris, 1858).

Mxit'ar Ayriivanec'i

Mxit'ar Ayriivanec'i, Histoire  
chronologique Mkhithar d'Airivank  
M. Brosset, trans. (St. Petersburg,  
 1869).

Mxit'ar Goš

Mxit'ar Goš, "The Albanian Chronicle  
 of Mxit'ar Goš", C.J.F. Dowsett,  
 trans. BSOAS #21 (1958).

Afakk' [Fables], (Venice, 1854).

Girk' datastani [Law Book],  
 X. T'orosyan, ed. (Erevan, 1975).

Q

Qazvini, The Geographical Part  
of the Nuzhat-al-Qulub of Hamd-Allah  
Mustawfi of Qazvin, G. Le Strange,  
 trans. (London, 1919).

Rashid al-Dīn

Rashid al-Dīn, The Successors of  
Genghis Khan, J.A. Boyle, trans.  
 (New York, 1971).

Sbornik letopisei [Collection of  
Chronicles], A.K. Arends, trans.  
 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946).

SA

Samuēl of Ani, Samuēli k'ahanayi  
Anec'woy hawak munk' i groc' patmagrac'  
[Samuel the Priest of Ani's Collection  
of Historians' Writings], A. Ter--  
 Mik'eleian, ed. (Valarsapat, 1893).

Trans. : Collection d'historiens arméniens, M. Brosset, trans., vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1876).

Schiltberger

Johann Schiltberger, The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, J.B. Telfer, trans. (London, 1879).

Smbat Sparapet

Smpat Sparapet, Smbatay Sparapeti taregirk [Chronicle of Smbat Sparapet], S. Agelean, ed. (Venice, 1956).

SO

Step'annos Orbelean, Patmut'iwn nahangin Sisakan arareal Step annosi Orbelean ark'episkoposi Siwneac [History of the State of Sisakan by Step'annos Orbelean, Archbishop of Siwnik], K. Sahnazareanc, ed. (Paris, 1859).

Trans. : Histoire de la Siounie, M. Brosset, trans. 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1864-66).

Spuler, Bertold

History of the Mongols Based on Eastern and Western Accounts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, translated from the German by H. and S. Drummond (Berkeley, 1972).

TA

T'ovma Arcruni, T'ovmayi vardapeti Arcrunwoy Patmut'iwn tann Arcruneac [Vardapet T'ovma Arcruni's History of the Arcrunid House], (St. Petersburg, 1887).

TM

T'ovma Mecop'ec'i, Patmut'iwn Lank-T'amuray ew yaJordac' iwroc' arareal T'ovma vardapeti Mecop'ec'woy [The History of Tamerlane and His Successors by Vardapet T'ovma Mecop'ec'i], K. Sahnazareanc, ed. (Paris, 1860).

- Trans. : Exposé des guerres de Tamerlan et de Schah-Rokh dans l'Asie occidentale, d'après la chronique arménienne inédite de Thomas de Medzoph, Felix Neve, trans. (Brussels, 1861).
- TM, col. T'ovma Mecop'ec'u višatakarane [T'ovma Mecop'ec'i's Colophon] K. Kostanean, ed. (Tiflis, 1892).
- VA, Geog. Vardan Arewelc'i, Ašxarhac'oyc' Vardanay Vardapeti [Geography of Vardan Vardapet], H. Berberian, ed. (Paris, 1960).
- VA, Hist. Vardan Arewelc'i, Hawak'umn patmut'ean Vardanay vardapeti lusabaneal [Compilation of History by Vardapet Vardan Arewelc'i] (Venice, 1862).
- VT Vimakan taregir [Annal of Inscriptions], K. Kostaneanc', ed. (St. Petersburg, 1913).
- WR William of Rubruck, The Journey of William of Rubruck, W. Rockhill, trans. (London, 1900).
- Xačikyan, L. 14CC, XIV Dari hayeren jefagreri hišatakaranner [Colophons of XIVth Century Armenian Manuscripts], L. Xačikyan, ed., (Erevan, 1950).
- 15CC, XV Dari hayeren jefagreri hišatakaranner [Colophons of XVth Century Armenian Manuscripts], L. Xačikyan, ed., vol. I (1401--1450), (Erevan, 1955).
- Yaqut Yaqut al-Hamavi. Passages relevant to Armenia and neighboring areas have been drawn from the Armenian translation in Arabakan, pp. 5-121.
- Yov. Yiš. Yišatakarank' jefagrac' [Manuscript Colophons], G. Yovsepean, ed. (Antilias, 1951).

## II. Literature

- Abelyan, M., Erker [Works] vol. 4 (Erevan, 1970) reprint of Havoc' hin grakanut' yan patmut' yun [History of Ancient Armenian Literature] vol. 2 (Erevan, 1946).
- Abrahamyan, "Ruk'n-ed-Dini partut' yune [The Defeat of Rukn al-Din]", Telekagir #5-6 (1941).
- Adontz, N.A., Armenia in the Period of Justinian, N.G. Garsoian, translator and editor (Lisbon, 1970) originally published in Russian in 1908.
- Akinean, N., "Akanc' kam Akneri vank'e [Akanc' or Akner Monastery]", HA (1948).
- "Alt'amaray kat'olikosac' gawazanagirk'e [The Succession of the Kat'olikos of Alt'amar]", HA (1916).
- "Grigor k'ahanay Aknerc'i patmagir T'at'arac' Patmut'-iwn 1250-1335 [Grigor the Priest of Akner, Historian of the History of the T'at'ars]", HA (1948).
- Review of R.Blake's History of the Nation of the Archers HA (1955).
- Review of Kirakos Ganjakec'i (Tiflis, 1909), HA (1910).
- Review of L. Xaçikyan's 14CC, HA (1951).
- Ališan, L., Hayapatum [Antiquities], (Venice, 1901).
- Sirak (Venice, 1890).
- Sisakan (Venice, 1893).
- Ali-zade, A.A., Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaja i politicheskaja istorija Azerbaidzhana XIII-XIV vv [The Socio-Economic and Political History of Azerbaijan in the XIII-XIV Centuries], (Baku, 1956).

Allen, W.E.D., A History of the Georgian People (New York, 1971) reprint of the 1932 edition.

Anasyan, H.S., Haykakan matenagitut'yun [Armenian Bibliography] vol. 1 (Erevan, 1959).

Atak'elyan, B.N., "Aprank'avin artadrut'van ev arhestagorcut'-van texnikavi zargac ume havastanum IX-XIII darerum [Commodity Production and the Development of Craft Technology in Armenia in the IX-XIII Centuries]", PBH #2-3 (1959).

-- "Hayastani miġnadaryan k'alak'neri bnakčut'van soc'ial-akan kazme [The Social Composition of Medieval Armenian Cities]", PBH #2 (1958).

-- "Mecatunneri k'alak'avin vernaxavi jevavorume [Formation of the Mecatun Urban Upper Stratum]", HAP ch. 34.

Avagyan, S.A., "Tanutrut'iwn" termine Ani XI dari arjan-agrut'van mej [The Term "Tanutrut'iwn" in an Xith Century Inscription from Ani]", PBH #2 (1971).

Avdalbegyan, T'., "Haykakan arjanagrut'yunneri mej mi galnik' ev nra nšanagrut'yune Hayastani 13-14rd dareri tntes-akan patmut'van hamar [A Secret in the Armenian Inscriptions and Its Significance for the Economic History of Armenia in the 13-14th Centuries]", Telekagir #2 (1927).

Babayan, L.H., Aknarkner miġnadaryan havastani patmut'yunic [Episodes from the History of Medieval Armenia] (Erevan, 1966).

-- "Hayastane Hulavyan iŝxanut'van tirapetut'van nerk'o [Armenia under Rūlegūid Domination]", HAP ch. 37.

-- "Hayastane mončolakan tirapetut'van arajin ōrjanum [Armenia in the First Period of the Mongol Domination]", HAP ch. 36.

-- "Mončolakan aršavank' nere ev Hayastani nvačume [The Mongol Invasions and the Conquest of Armenia]", HAP ch. 35.

- Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Armenii v XIII-XIV vekakh [The Socio-Economic and Political History of Armenia in the XIII-XIVth Centuries], (Moscow, 1969).
- "Zak'aryan erek' ishanut'yunneri kazmavorume [The Formation of the Three Zak'arid Principalities]", HAP ch.32.
- Baidasaryan, E. M., "Erznkavi haykakan ishanut'yune XIII-XV darerum [The Armenian Principality of Erzinjan in the XIII-XV Centuries]", Lraber #2 (1970).
- Bart'ikyan, H.M., "Hayastane Byuzandakan tirapetut'yan nerk'o, kronakan k'alak akanut'yune [Armenia under Byzantine Domination, the Religious Policy] HAP ch. 25.
- Barxutareanc', M., Arc'ax (Baku, 1895).
- Barxutaryan, S., "Mi k'ani ditolut'yunner Erevani Kat'olike ekelec'u arjanagrut'yan veraberyal [A Few Observations on the Inscription of Erevan's Cathedral Church]", Telekagir #5 (1947).
- Bausani, A., "Religion under the Mongols", SMP ch. 7.
- Berberian, H., "Le Patriarcat arménien du sultanat de Roum", REA, n.s. #3(1966).
- Bofnazyan, S.V., "Hayastani nvačume seljuk-t'urk'eri kolmic' [The Conquest of Armenia by the Saljuq Turks]", HAP ch. 26.
- "Salduxyannere Karinum [The Saltukids in Karin]", HAP ch.28.
- "Soc'ial-tntesakan haraberut'yunnere kilikyan haykakan petut'yunum [Socio-Economic Relations in the Cilician Armenian State], (Erevan, 1973).
- Boyle, J.A., ed., The Cambridge History of Iran, vol. 5, the Saljuq and Mongol Periods (Cambridge, 1968)[SMP].
- "The Journey of Het'um I, King of Little Armenia, to the Court of the Great Khan Möngke", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964).

-- "Kirakos of Ganjak on the Mongols", Central Asiatic Journal #8 (1963).

Budge, E.A. Wallis, The Monks of Kublai Khan (London, 1928).

Çamçean, M., Patmut' iwn Hayoc' skzbanē ašxarhi minčew zam teafn 1784 est awandeloy aylayl matenagrac [History of the Armenians from the Creation of the World to A.D. 1784 According to the Accounts of Diverse Sources] 3 vol. (Venice, 1784-86).

Cahen, Cl., Pre-Ottoman Turkey (London, 1968).

-- "Une campagne du seldjukide Alp-Arslan en Géorgie", Bedi Karthlisa 41-42 n.s. XIII-XIV (1962).

Canard, M., "La campagne arménienne du sultan Saljuquide Alp Arslan et la prise d'Ani en 1064", REA, n.s. (1965).

Charanis, P., The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire (Lisbon, 1963).

Cleaves, F.W., "The Mongolian Names and Terms in the History of the Nation of the Archers by Grigor of Akanc'", Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies #3-4 (1949).

Der Nersessian, S., Armenia and the Byzantine Empire (Cambridge, Mass., 1945).

-- The Armenians (New York, 1970).

Eremyan, S., Amirspasalar Zak'aria Erkaynabazuk [Amirspasalar Zak'aria Mxargrceli], (Erevan, 1944).

-- "Liparit zoravari haĵordnere ev Danišmanyan tohmi cagman xndire [The Successors of General Liparit and the Problem of the Origin of the Danishmandid Line]", Telekagir #8 (1947).



Galstyan, A.G., "The Conquest of Armenia by the Mongol Armies", Armenian Review #27 (1975).

-- "The First Armeno-Mongol Negotiations", Armenian Review #29 (1976).

Garsoian, N. G., "Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia", HA (1976).

Grigoryan, G.M., "Dramakan haraberut'yunneri zargac'ume Syunik'um ev St. Orbelyani harkac'uc'aki xndire [The Development of Money Relationships in Siwnik' and the Question of St. Orbelean's Tax List]", Lraber #2 (1966).

-- "Step'anos Orbelyan", PBH #4(1976).

Hakobyan, T'.X., Havastani patmakan asxarhagrut'yun [Armenia's Historical Geography], (Erevan, 1968).

-- Step'anos Orbelyan (Erevan, 1960).

-- Syunik'i t'agavorut'yune [The Kingdom of Siwnik'] (Erevan, 1966).

Harut'yunyan, B., "Feod-in ev beneficium-in hamaspataxanol terminnere hay mi'nadaryan grakanut'van me [Terms Corresponding to Feod and Beneficium in Medieval Armenian Literature]", Lraber #12 (1958).

Hewsen, R., "The Meliks of Eastern Armenia", REA article I IX(1972), II X(1973/74), III XI(1975/76).

Hovhannisyan, A., Drvagner hay azatagrakan mtk'i patmut'van vol. 1 [Episodes from the History of Armenian Liberational Thought], (Erevan, 1957).

Huart, C., A History of Arabic Literature (New York, 1903).

- Husseinov, R., "La conquête de l'Azerbaïdjan par les Seldjucides", Bedi Karthlisa 48-49 vol. XIX-XX (1965).
- Isakanyan, V.K., "Arcrunyac' artagalt'i masin [On the Arcrunid Emigration]", PBH #3 (1965).
- Jalalean, S., Canaparhordut'wn i mecn Hayastan [Journey to Greater Armenia] I(Tiflis, 1842), II(Tiflis, 1858).
- Kazhdan, A.P., Armiane v sostave gospodstvuushchego klassa Vizantii v XI-XII vv. [Armenians in the Composition of the Ruling Class of Byzantium in the XI-XII Centuries], (Moscow, 1975).
- Kirakosyan, G.E., "Matenagitakan telekut'yunner Dop'yanneri masin [Bibliographical Information on the Dop'eans]", PBH #1 (1969).
- Korkhmazian, E. M., Armianskaia miniatiura Kryma [Armenian Miniatures of Crimea], (Erevan, 1978).
- Kurdian, H., "Mamikoneanneri Dseł čule [The Dseł Branch of the Mamikoneans]", Bazmaver (1956).
- Lafadaryan, K., "Patmahnagitakan ditotut'yunner nor Berdi Kyurikvanneri ishanut'yan masin [Historiographical Observations on the Kiwrikan Principality of Nor Berd]", Telekagir #4-5 (1940).
- Lalayan, E., "Sisian", Azgagrakan Handes (1899).
- "Ganjaki gawaf [The District of Ganjak]", Azgagrakan Handes (1899).
- Laurent, M.J., "Byzane et Antioche sous le curopalate Philarete", REA IX (1929).
- Le Strange, G., Mesopotamia and Persia under the Mongols in the Fourteenth Century A.D. (London, 1903).
- Ligeti, L. "Le Lexique mongol de Kirakos de Gandzak", Acta Orientalia Hungarica, XVIII (1965).
- Lordkipanidze, M.D., Istoriia gruzii XI-nachala XIII beka [The History of Georgia from the XI to the beginning of the XIII Century], (Tbilisi, 1974).

- Manandyan, H.A., Feodalizme hin Hayastanum [Feudalism in Ancient Armenia], (Erevan, 1934).
- K'nnakan tesut'yun Hay žolovrdi patmut'yan [Critical Survey of the History of the Armenian People], vol.3 (Erevan, 1952).
- The Trade and Cities of Armenia in Connection with Ancient World Trade, N.G.Garsoian, trans. (Lisbon, 1965).
- Margaryan, H.G., "Mižfeodalakan payk'are Georgi III-i žamanak ev K'urd amirapete [The Inter-Feudal Struggle in the Time of Georgi III, and the Amirapet K'urd]", Uraber #11 (1975).
- Marr, N. Ia., "Arkaun, mongol'skoe nazvanie khristian[Arkaun, the Mongolian Designation for Christians]", Vizantiiskii Vremennik XII(1905).
- Massé, H., "Le sultan seldjoukide Keykabad Ier et l'Arménie", REA IX(1929).
- Mélikoff, I., "Géorgiens et Arméniens dans la littérature épique des Turcs d'Anatolie", Bedi Karthlisa 36-37 n.s. XI-XII (1961).
- La Geste de Melik Danismend (Paris, 1960).
- Melik'set'-Bek, L., "Geragovn datarani ev datavarut'yan masin Zak'arean Hayastanum [On the Supreme Court and Legal Proceedings in Zak'arid Armenia]", Telekagir #3-4(1945).
- Vrac' albyurnere Hayastani ev hayeri masin [Georgian Sources on Armenia and on the Armenians], vol. A (Erevan, 1934), vol. B (Erevan, 1936).
- Mikaelian, G.G., Istoriia Kilikiiskogo Armianskogo gosudarstva [History of the Cilician Armenian State], (Erevan, 1952).
- Minorsky, V., Studies in Caucasian History (London, 1953).

- Moule, A.C., Christians in China before 1550 (New York, 1930).
- Movsesian, L., "Histoire des rois Kurikian de Lori", P. Macler, trans., REA (1927).
- Muradyan, P.M., "Vrac'eren arjanagrut'yunner Hayastanum Pinjahank", [Georgian Inscriptions in Armenia: Pinjahank"], Labrer #1 (1973).
- Mušeian, X.A., "Dramayin šrjanafut'yune Hayastanum IX-XIV darerum [The Circulation of Money in Armenia in the IX-XIVth Centuries]", PBH #4 (1971).
- Orbeli, I.A., "h'Asan Dzhalal kniaz' Khachenskiĭ [Hasan Jalal, Prince of Xaçen]", Izvestiia imp. AN (1909).
- Oskanyan, A.M., "Ašxaragrakan determinizme hay patmagrut'yan me", [Geographical Determinism in Armenian Historiography]", PBH #2 (1960).
- Oskean, H., "Kirakos Ganjakec'i", HA (1922).
- "Vardan Arewelc'i", HA (1921).
- Perikhanyan, A., "Drevnearmianskie vostoniki [The ostanik's in Ancient Armenia]", VDI #2 (1956).
- Petoyan, V., "Sasuni T'ofnikyan išxanut'yune [The T'ofnikean Principality of Sasun]", Telekagir #2 (1955).
- Petrowicz, G., "Miabanoĭ elbayrnere ew Hay ekelec'in [The Uniators and the Armenian Church]", HA (1969).
- P'irzalemean, L., Notark' hayoc' (Constantinople, 1888).
- Sahinyan, A., "Mamikonyan-Hamazaspyan tohme Hayastanum XII-XIII darerum [The Mamikonean-Hamazaspean Clan of Northern Armenia in the XII-XIII Centuries]", Labrer #3 (1968).

- Sahnazarean, A., "Zak'arean tohmi caguma[ Origin of the Zak'arid Clan]", Sotakat (Vatarsapat, 1913).
- Sanjian, A.K., Colophons of Armenian Manuscripts 1301-1480 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).
- Saunders, J.J., "The Decline and Fall of Christianity in Medieval Asia", Journal of Religious History #2(1968).
- The History of the Mongol Conquests (London, 1971).
- Spuler, B., The Muslim World, part II, The Mongol Period (Leiden, 1960).
- Sruanjteanc', G., T'oros Albar: Hayastani Ćambord[Brother T'oros, Traveller of Armenia] 2 vol. (Constantinople, 1879-85).
- Taşean, Y., C'uc'ak hayerēn jefagrac' Kayserakan matenadaranin i Vienna [Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts at the Imperial Library of Vienna], (Vienna, 1891).
- C'uc'ak hayerēn jefagrac' matenadaranin Mxit'areanc' i Vienna [Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts at the Mxit'arist Library in Vienna], (Vienna, 1895).
- T'emuryan, V., "Hayeri artagalt'e depi Gamirk' llrd darum [The Emigration of Armenians to Cappadocia in the 11th Century]", Telekagir #2 (1955).
- Ter-Davt'yan, K'.S., Pamiatniki Armianskoi Agiografii [Monuments of Armenian Hagiography], (Erevan, 1973).
- Ter-Lewondyan, A., The Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia, N.G.Garsoian, trans. (Lisbon, 1976).
- "Hayerē Egiptosum [The Armenians in Egypt]", HAP ch.30.
- "K'ust-i Kapkoh varčakan miavori verapruknere Kalifayut'yan zamanak [Survivals of the Administrative Unit of Kust-i Kapkoh in the Time of the Caliphate]", Telekagir #9 (1958).

- "Sah Armenneri amirayut'yune Xlat'um [The Emirate of the Shah Armenians at Xlat']", HAP ch.28.
  - "Xedenekyan Arcruninere Vaspurakanum [The Xedenekean Arcrunids in Vaspurakan]", HAP ch. 28.
  - "Zak'aria ev Ivanei arabataf arianagrut'yune anberdum [Zak'aria's and Ivane's Inscription in Arabic from Anberd]", PBH #1 (1971).
- Thomson, R.W., "The Influence of their Environment on the Armenians in Exile in the Eleventh Century", Congrès international des études byzantines, 13th (Oxford, 1967) [Congress].
- Togan, A.Z.V., "Still Missing Works of Rashid al-Dīn", Central Asiatic Journal #9 (1964).
- T'op'uzyan, Ō. X., "Mi'agetk'i ev Asorik'i haykakan gait'-avayrere [Armenian Settlements in Mesopotamia and Syria]", HAP ch. 30.
- Toumanoff, C., "Armenia and Georgia", The Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV, The Byzantine Empire, part I (Cambridge, 1966) ch. XIV.
- "Background to Mantzikert", Congress (Oxford, 1967).
  - "Caucasia and Byzantium", Traditio 27 (1971).
  - "The Fifteenth-Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia", Traditio 7 (1949-51).
  - "The Mamikonids and the Liparitids", Armeniaca (Venice, 1969).
  - "Medieval Georgian Historical Literature(VII-XVth Centuries)", Traditio 1 (1943).
  - Studies in Christian Caucasian History (Georgetown, 1963).

- T'uršyan, H.G., "Šah-i-Armenner [The Shāh-i-Armens]", PBH #4 (1964).
- Ulubabyan, B.A., Xačeni išanut'yune X-XVI darerum [The Principality of Xačen in the X-XVI Centuries], (Erevan, 1975).
- Vryonis, S., The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century (Los Angeles, 1971) [DMH].
- "Seljuk Gulams and Ottoman Devshirmes", Der Islam XLI (1965).
- Xačikyan, L.S., "Syunyac' Ōrbelyanneri Burt'elyan čvule [The Biwrt'elian Branch of the Siwnid Orbeleans]", BM #9 (1969).
- "Hayastane Čobanyanneri ev Jelairyanneri tirapetut'yan žamanakaš'lanum [Armenia in the Period of the Domination of the Chobanids and Jalayirids]", HAP IV ch. 1.
- "Hayastani k'alak'akan vičake ev soc'ial-tntesakan haraberut yunnere XIV-XV darerum [Armenia's Political Situation and Socio-Economic Relations in the XIV-XVth Centuries]", HAP IV ch. 1.
- Yovsēp'ean, G., "Nor niwt'er T'ovma Mecop'ec'u kensagrut'ean hamar [New Materials for the Biography of T'ovma Mecop'ec'i]", Ararat (1913).
- Potomstvo Tarsaicha Orbeliana i Mina-Khatuny [The Posterity of Tarsayič Orbelean and Mina-Khatun], Khristianskii Vostok, II (1913).
- Xaibakeank' kam Prōšeank' [The Xaibakeans or Prōšeans] (Antelias, 1969) reprint of the 1928 edition.
- Yuzbašyan, K.N., "Deilemity v povestvovanii Aristakēsa Lastivertsi [The Dailamites in Aristakes Lastivertsi's Narration]", Palestinskii Sbornik #7 (1962).

- with Agadzanov, S.G., "K istorii tiurskikh nabegov na Armeniiu v XIv [Toward the History of the Turkish Raids on Armenia in the 11th Century]", Palestinskii Sbornik #12 (1965).
- Zamkoçyan, H., "Ani k'alak'um erku XIIIrd arjanagrut'yunneri masin [On Two 13th Century Inscriptions from the City of Ani]", GAEPH #47 (1955).
- "Patmut'iwn vasn azgin netolac' erki helinake [The Author of the Work History of the Nation of the Archers]" GAEPH #23 (1946).



## GLOSSARY

<u>amir-hejub</u>	Grand Chamberlain.
<u>amir-spasalar</u>	Commander-in-Chief of the Army.
<u>atabek</u>	"father-guardian".
<u>azat</u>	Arm./Iran. literally "free", designation for lesser gentry.
<u>bahatur</u>	"hero".
<u>basqag</u>	"tax collector".
<u>didebul</u>	Georg. "great one", high noble.
<u>elchi</u>	envoy, ambassador.
<u>eristav</u>	Georg. "duke", head of a province.
<u>hayrenik'</u>	Arm. "patrimony", a form of landhold.
<u>Il-Khān</u>	Mong. subordinate Khān, title of the Khan of Iran (i.e., subordinate to the Great Khān).
<u>injū</u>	Mong. "demesne", a landhold directly tributary to the Khan or members of the Khan's family.
<u>jizya</u>	poll-tax, originally on non-Muslims.
<u>kat'olikos</u>	head of the Armenian Church.
<u>kesik(toyk)</u>	"imperial guard".
<u>kharaj</u>	land tax.
<u>khatun</u>	"queen, princess, lady".
<u>mal</u>	"property, cattle tax".
<u>mandat'urt'-uxuc'es</u>	Georg. "High Marshall" of the Georgian Court.
<u>mecatun</u>	Arm. literally "of a great House", wealthy merchant.

msaxurt'-uxuc'es

Georg. Treasurer of the Georgian Court.

naxarar

Arm. "noble".

noyin

- "general, commander, official".

paiza

. tablet of authority.

quriltai

. national assembly.

sahib-divan

. Minister of Finance.

shahna

. "guards".

taghar

a tax in kind.

tanuter

Arm. "lord of the House".

ter

Arm. "lord", secular and clerical.

tumen

. 10,000 troops.

tun

Arm. "House, clan, family".

vardapet

Arm. doctor of the Armenian Church.

varligh

"decree, order, law".

vasax

code of law.

yayla

"pasturing grounds".